DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 463 32 EA 003 691

TITLE Hawaii State Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1970: State Summary of Title I, ESEA.

INSTITUTION Hawaii State Dept. of Education, Honolulu.
REPORT NO OE-4320
PUB DATE Nov 70
NOTE 217p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Hawaii

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Hawaii State Department of Education; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, State ESEA Title I personnel, and university personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff and university consultants; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (Pages 33-55 may reproduce poorly.) (EA)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053463

STATE SUMMARY OF TITLE I, ESEA

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1970

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR

FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1970

OE-4320

STATE OF HAWAII

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

November, 1970

EA 003 691

STATE OF HAWAII

BOARD OF EDUCATION

November, 1970

Dr. Richard E. Ando (Acting Chairman), Honolulu
Mr. Hiroshi Yamashita (Acting Vice Chairman), Hawaii
Mr. George S. Adachi, Leeward Oahu
Mr. C. Ronald Harker, Kauai
Mr. Eugene E. Harrison, Central Oahu
Mrs. Myrtle K. Kaapu, Oahu-at-large
Mr. Robert Kumasaka, Oahu-at-large
Mr. Marvin Midkiff, Windward Oahu
Mrs. Ruth Tabrah, Hawaii
Mr. Kiyoto Tsubaki, Maui
Mr. Tommy Wong, Oahu-at-large

Mr. William A. Waters, Acting Superintendent
(Secretary to the Board of Education)

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

Arthur F. Mann, Assistant Superintendent

John K. Uchima, Administrator, Compensatory Education

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

SECTION	PAGE
BACKGROUND AND BASIC STATISTICS	1
STAFF VISITS TO LEA'S	1
NEW PROCEDURES	5
EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT	7
1. Reading Achievement	7
2. School Attitude	8
3. Evaluation Responsibilities	8
CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE PROJECTS	11
COST-EFFECTIVENESS RELATIONSHIP	11
EFFECTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES	11
COOPERATIVE FUNDING	13
NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION	18
TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE TRAINING	18
COMMUNITY-PARENT INVOLVEMENT	22
APPENDIX A - SCHOOL ATTITUDE INVENTORY	
APPENDIX B - ABSTRACT OF APPROVED PROJECTS	
APPENDIX C - EVALUATIVE ANALYSIS OF DATA	

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1.	COUNTY GRANTS AND DISTRICT ALLOCATIONS	2
2.	PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS	3
3.	NO. OF PROJECTS AND PARTICIPANTS THROUGH THE YEARS	4
4.	STAFF VISITS TO LEA'S	5
5.	ACHIEVEMENT ON READING/LANGUAGE TESTS (BY LEVEL)	9
6.	ACHIEVEMENT ON READING/LANGUAGE TESTS (BY DISTRICT)	10
7.	SUMMARY OF FUNDING AND BENEFICIARIES	15
8.	NUMBER OF PERSONS TRAINED - SUMMER	20
9.	NUMBER OF PERSONS TRAINED - REGULAR YEAR	21

BACKGROUND AND BASIC STATISTICS

The Department of Education of the State of Hawaii has a role which is unique in the nation. It is a state educational agency as well as the local educational agency. Being a single school system with one board of education, the Department provides direct administrative, supervisory, fiscal and supportive services to the schools. It also certifies, processes and assigns all personnel employed by the system.

For administrative purposes, the school system is divided into seven districts located in the four counties of the State. The Island of Oahu, which comprises the City and County of Honolulu, has four districts (Honolulu, Central, Leeward and Windward). The remaining three districts are located in the other three island counties of Hawaii, Maui and Kauai. Two of the districts include more than one island. Maui District, includes the islands of Maui, Molokai and Lanai, while Kauai District includes the islands of Kauai and Niihau.

Within the limitations imposed by the Hawaii State school system, the seven administrative districts have been regarded as local educational agencies for Title I purposes. All of these seven administrative districts meet the requirements to receive Title I funds; therefore, the State Title I grant for FY 1970 was allocated to the districts in accordance with the Title I regulations. (See Table 1).

In the 1969-70 school year there were 215 public schools in the State of Hawaii with a total enrollment of 178,564 students (K through 12, special and regular schools). A total of 32,651 students were enrolled in the 112 private schools operating in the State.

There were a total of sixty-three (63) approved projects (see Appendix B for summaries) that were implemented during FY 1970 in 81 schools. (See Table 2). Twenty-nine (29) projects were operated during the regular school term and thirty-four (34) during the summer. All seven districts operated the approved projects in both the regular and summer terms.

Among the students who participated in the projects a total of 7,602 were enrolled in the public schools and a total of 272 in non-public schools. Of the participating students from public schools, 39 were handicapped. An examination of the annual total of participants since 1966 show a decrease each year. (See Table 3).

II. STAFF VISITS TO LEA'S

During FY 1970, one administrator and five Title I connected specialists made a total of 150 staff visits to the LEA's. The objectives and effects, and the numbers and proportions of the visits are given in Table 4.

TABLE 1

TITLE I, ESEA

FISCAL YEAR 1970

COUNTY GRANT AND DISTRICT ALLOCATIONS

STATE GRANT: $2,606,146

COUNTY GRANTS

COUNTY	NO. OF CHILDREN	AMOUNT	PER CENT
Honolulu	12,675	$2,004,301	76.91
Hawaii	2,256	356,742	13.69
Maui	944	149,275	5.72
Kauai	606	95,828	3.68
TOTAL:	16,481	$2,606,146	100.00

DISTRICT ALLOCATIONS

DISTRICT	AMOUNT	PER CENT
Honolulu	$1,252,889	48.1
Central Oahu	197,425	7.6
Leeward Oahu	276,994	10.6
Windward Oahu	276,994	10.6
Hawaii	356,742	13.7
Maui	149,275	5.7
Kauai	95,827	3.7
TOTAL:	$2,606,146	100.0

TABLE 2

TITLE I, ESEA

FISCAL YEAR 1970

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

DISTRICT	ELEMENTARY	INTERMEDIATE	HIGH	TOTAL
Honolulu	15	5	3	23
Central	5	1	2	8
Leeward	4	1	2	7
Windward	6	2	2	10
Hawaii	9	3	3	15
Maui	9	1	2	12
Kauai	5	--	1	6
TOTAL:	53	13	15	81

TABLE 3

TITLE I, ESEA

NO. OF PROJECTS AND PARTICIPANTS THROUGH THE YEARS

FISCAL YEAR	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS	NO. OF PROJECTS
1966	74,141	94
1967	17,298	116
1968	10,337	123
1969	8,891	49
1970	7,874	63

TABLE 4

OBJECTIVES	EFFECTS	No. of Visits	Proportion
PLANNING (guidelines; school eligibility; orientation-information)	Modification of guidelines Affirmation of guidelines	7	5%
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (specific proposal negotiation; operational review; workshops for districts)	Proposal modifications and improvements	32	21%
PROJECT MONITORING-PROJECT OPERATION (district and school level)	Project modifications and improvements	109	73%
PROGRAM EVALUATION (design; methods; implementation; results; trends)	Modifications in evaluation designing and implementation	2	1%
	TOTAL	150	100%

III. NEW PROCEDURES

The 1969-70 school year was a period in which the existing State Title I procedures were reviewed and revised. Promising new procedures were explored to assist in attaining the goal of improving the projects that were being implemented in the schools and districts of the State.

One of the first activities attempted was the revision of the existing State Title I guidelines. The objectives were to:

A. Clarify the Title I regulations for the designers and implementors of the projects.

B. Provide effective procedures in developing, implementing and evaluating the projects.

C. Strengthen the State Title I Program.

D. Reflect the latest national guidelines.

Another was the vigorous enforcement of the State and Federal program requirements. One method was the series of project visitations made to monitor projects and to gather data for use in the preparation of the State evaluation report. The visitations also provided opportunities to furnish technical assistance to the district personnel in modifying the projects to better meet the needs of the participating children.

A second method used in this enforcement of program requirements was the initiation of procedures for thorough review of all Title I project applications submitted. Several problems arose in the course of initiating this method because of misunderstandings, but most of them were resolved in the negotiations that were conducted in an atmosphere of mutual learning and of sharing information to modify the project proposals into approvable forms.

A third activity attempted, which was to facilitate the dissemination of information regarding the program requirements, project designs and other instructions regarding the Title I program, was the series of conferences held for the district coordinators. These conferences were designed mainly to provide the coordinators with assistance in developing more effective projects. In one of these conferences, Mr. Paul Miller of Area Desk Five, U.S. Office of Education, met with the district coordinators to clarify certain technical problems relating to the Title I program.

During the school year a continuous effort was made to develop effective evaluative procedures that would:

A. Apply to the majority of the projects.

B. Provide information that was pertinent and useful to the project personnel, the district personnel, the department and the U. S. Office of Education.

C. Enable all project personnel to implement them.

This effort will be continued until the desired procedures can be found or developed.

To complement this exploration of evaluative procedures, a number of discussions were held among the state agency and district personnel staffs to develop more effective evaluation procedures. These discussions culminated in the workshop held in May, 1970 in which the district personnel were shown some techniques in designing, implementing and evaluating their projects more effectively.

A special effort was made to involve representatives from the eligible non-public schools in all of the conferences and workshops as well as the discussions that were conducted. The district coordinators were reminded of the program requirement to include in the proposed projects the educationally deprived children in the non-public schools residing in the eligible attendance areas.

IVA. EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

1. READING ACHIEVEMENT

The achievement in reading and language arts for project participants has been measured by nationally standardized tests. A number of different tests were used by the projects, resulting in information which is a statewide compilation rather than a comprehensive statistical analysis. For this reason, interpretations are of a very general nature.

The following tests were used in making comparisons of reading and language achievement:

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, forms B, C, D and E, comprehension subtest
Stanford Achievement Test, reading subtest, and spelling and language subtest
Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity and Achievement Tests
California Reading Test
Gray Oral Reading Test
Wide Range Achievement Test, reading subtest
Monroe Reading Aptitude Test, language subtest
Botel Reading Inventory

Complete data is available for 2,759 students who were tested for reading and language arts achievement on a pre-post basis during the 1969-70 school year. About half of these students took the Wide Range Achievement Test. Approximately 40% used the Gates-MacGinitie series. The remainder of tests noted above were used for the other students.

Student progress was considered to have occurred in three general categories. The first included those students whose academic achievement met or exceeded the objectives. Two criteria were considered, progress ratios and t-tests on pre-post means.

The first criterion was that of the ratio between months tested progress and the pre-post test interval. All class ratios of 1.0 or greater were considered evidence of meeting or exceeding the general objective of reading achievement at an average or better rate. Where grade equivalent levels were not employed (Honolulu District), t-test significance at the .10 level or better was used as evidence of satisfactory student progress in meeting or exceeding objectives.

The second student progress category included students who made some tested forward progress noted by a higher post than pre-test raw score. This category is also reflected in positive progress ratios under 1.0 and in positive t-test values not reaching significance at the .10 level.

The third student progress cateogry included those who made no tested progress or whose post-test scores were lower than pre-test scores. These are also reflected in negative progress ratios and negative t-test values whether or not significant.

Tables 5 and 6 indicate student progress by grade level and by administrative district. Over the entire state complete pre-post data was available for 2,759 project participants during the regular school year. Of these 2,759 participants in both public and private schools, 1,170 or 42.2% had progress in reading and language arts which met or exceeded project objectives. Another 970 students or 35.2% made some progress yet did not meet objectives. Thus a total of 2,140 students or 77.6% made academic progress during the year. Many others, however, (619 or 22.4%) had either no forward progress or regressed somewhat.

Examination of the tested reading and language arts achievement by the seven districts in Hawaii reveals some differences. While by the state average 42.4% of students reached or exceeded objectives, district percentages based on class means ranged from 0% in Windward District to 49.5% in Honolulu District. Those who made some progress ranged from 4.0% in Kauai District to 63.5% in Windward District, while the state average was 35.2%. And those students who made no progress ranged from 14.2% in Honolulu District to 51.5% in Kauai District, the state average being 22.4%.

Student progress by grade level groupings was also calculated. General trends are few, but it appears that almost all of the children in kindergarten and first grades (95.5%) met or exceeded the objectives, while those in grades 10-12 seldom did (13.8%). The middle grades of 4-6 and 7-9 had the largest number of students who made no progress, with about one-third of the project participants from these grades remaining stationary or dropping behind in tested reading and language skills. Thus only two-thirds of Title I classes of grades 4-9 children made some reading progress.

2. SCHOOL ATTITUDE

The State, in conjunction with a contracted agency, has begun to develop a School Attitude Inventory for grades 4-12. This instrument was administered to several thousand Title I participants on a pre-post basis during the 1969-70 year. Conclusions were that the instrument needs some rephrasing and statewide standardization but can be useful to Title I projects in the future. This task requires further investigation and may be carried out in the 1970-71 year if feasible.

General trends noted in the pilot phase were that students' favorable attitudes toward school declined both from pre to post testing and with increasing age. This conclusion is compatible with staff opinions. Students (and it is suspected staff, too) like school more in the fall than in May; and younger children like school more than older ones, as evidenced by campus disruptions and dropout incidences, both of which increase with age.

A copy of the pilot form of the instrument is included in the appendix. (See Appendix A).

3. EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Several general difficulties have been noted, and various remedies chosen. The major difficulty appeared not to be that of project adequacy but of evaluation adequacy. From the start of Title I through 1969-70, the State coordinated a testing program for project participants, with test

Table 5

ESEA Title I
1969-70
Achievement on Reading/Language Tests (By Level)

LEVEL		No Progress	Some Progress	Progress Meets or Exceeds Objectives	TOTAL
		Negative and Zero Ratios or Post mean-Pre mean Negative	Positive Ratios Under 1.0 or Post mean-Pre mean positive	Ratios 1.0 and Over or Positive t-Test at .10	
Grades K - 1	N	18	0	402	420
	%	4.5%	0%	95.5%	100%
Grades 2 - 3	N	156	475	332	807
	%	19.3%	39.5%	41.2%	100%
Grades 4 - 6	N	257	326	214	797
	%	32.2%	40.9%	26.9%	100%
Grades 7 - 9	N	158	105	207	470
	%	33.6%	22.3%	44.1%	100%
Grades 10 - 12	N	30	64	15	109
	%	27.5%	58.7%	13.8%	100%
TOTAL	N	619	970	1170	2759
	%	22.4%	35.2%	42.4%	100%

Table 6

ESEA Title I
1969-70
Achievement on Reading/Language Tests
By District

DISTRICT		No Progress	Some Progress	Progress Meets or Exceeds Objectives	TOTAL
		Negative and Zero Ratios or Post mean-Pre mean Negative	Positive Ratios Under 1.0 or Post mean-Pre mean positive	Ratios 1.0 and Over or Positive t-Test at .10	
Central	N	79	57	47	183
	%	43.2%	31.1%	25.7%	100%
Leeward	N	47	61	25	133
	%	35.3%	45.9%	18.8%	100%
Windward	N	42	73	0	115
	%	36.5%	63.5%	0%	100%
Hawaii	N	136	131	207	474
	%	28.7%	27.6%	43.7%	100%
Maui	N	34	60	48	142
	%	23.9%	42.3%	33.8%	100%
Kauai	N	52	4	45	101
	%	51.5%	4.0%	44.6%	100%
Honolulu	N	229	584	798	1611
	%	14.2%	36.3%	49.5%	100%
TOTAL	N	619	970	1170	2759
	%	22.4%	35.2%	42.4%	100%

scoring and interpretation contracted with another agency. Rather than realizing great benefits from this endeavor, it seemed that project level personnel were unable to feel involved in the evaluation and often did not pursue other evaluation procedures to supplement the standardized tests.

In addition, the test chosen did not meet with the wholehearted approval of all project personnel whose objectives and students were occasionally not measured adequately. Therefore, the major project evaluation design and implementation responsibilities will be at the district level in 1970-71. The State will continue to provide assistance where requested and may continue to develop the School Attitude Inventory under contract with an outside agency.

IVB. CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE PROJECTS

(See Appendix C).

IVC. COST-EFFECTIVENESS RELATIONSHIP

In comparing cost to effectiveness, Title I projects with language-reading objectives measured by standardized tests were compared with Title I per pupil expenditures for those projects. An achievement ratio was employed whereby months tested achievement in language and reading (weighed school means) was divided by months in test interval. All resulting school-wide achievement ratios were ranked. Per-pupil expenditures were also ranked, and ranged from $150 to $1,077. A total of 53 schools were included in the cost-effectiveness analysis. A rank order correlation coefficient was calculated ($r = 1 - \frac{6\,(\Sigma di^2)}{N\,(N^2 - 1)}$) and found to be +.14.

Thus we have concluded that there is little association between these two factors, and that factors other than cost must contribute more strongly to student achievement.

V. EFFECTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

The efforts of the State and district office personnel have been focused on the goal of developing procedures for the effective coordination of all of the compensatory education programs directed at the deprived children. Among the several activities that were attempted, the first was a review of the program requirements of current projects. It is essential that the restrictions of each program are understood in the attempt to develop procedures for overall program coordination.

Besides this review, another activity attempted was a series of discussions and planning sessions. Representatives from the offices of the state agency, district offices, resident groups of the target areas, community action groups, non-public schools, private agencies and other groups interested in compensatory education were invited to participate. The views, reactions and suggestions derived from these meetings have indicated the value for

continuing such exchanges. For the future, it is planned to include student participants in these meetings.

Title I, because it funds a majority of the compensatory education projects in the State, has an important part in the overall coordination plans. As the intent of the program, which is to supplement the regular school services for the educationally deprived, becomes better understood, more of the schools will begin to modify their regular school programs. Formal orientation for school personnel and community residents was initiated during the 1969-70 school year, and plans have been made to expand this in future years.

VIA. COOPERATIVE FUNDING

1. STATE GENERAL FUND

Two districts (Hawaii and Maui) in the State had one cooperative project each, using Title I and State funds. In each case, the project was about one-half state funded from State general funds rather than special categorical funds for compensatory education. The project summaries are included below.

MAUI DISTRICT PROJECT

School: MAUI HIGH

Project Description: This project is designed to provide a modified English-Social Studies Program for the educationally disadvantaged secondary students. The English and Social Studies Program are modified into a core program to coordinate the language arts instruction with social studies. The needs of the students are assessed on an individual basis; individual assessment enables teachers to do individualized corrective and developmental teaching.

Title I Input: Amount approved - $8,797.00
Personnel - 1 secondary teacher (full-time)

State Input: Amount approved - $9,350.00
Personnel - 1 secondary teacher (full-time)
No. of students to be served - 117

HAWAII DISTRICT PROJECT

Schools: 11 ELEMENTARY AND INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS IN HILO

Project Description:

a. Objectives of Project
   (1) To provide diagnostic services to students referred by classroom teachers.
   (2) To provide specific advice and materials to classroom teachers regarding the treatment of cases that are returned to them.
   (3) To provide treatment for especially difficult cases.
   (4) To provide year-round in-service experiences to classroom teachers who are found to have significant numbers of students with reading difficulties.

b. Services

Schools selected participating students from teacher referrals. The referred youngster was transported to the clinic and given a series of tests to determine the nature and severity of his reading retardation. The reading clinic staff selected the educationally deprived students on the basis of growth potentiality. The reading clinic scheduled six 45-minute periods daily, except Wednesdays, for remediation instruction.

In-service training for the clinician teachers included techniques of reading diagnosis, prescription for specific reading disabilities, and the rationale in the use of materials and equipment such as the controlled reader, Tach-X, and the language master.

In summarizing the overall gains, the average gain was 2.8 months of progress in reading for each month at the reading clinic. If an expected gain of one month is accepted as normal, this would be a gain of 1.8 months above expectancy for each month in attendance. On the other hand, learners with the kinds of deficiencies treated at the clinic very seldom achieve at the 1.0 per month rate. It would appear, therefore, that the overall average gain of 2.8 per month is even more significant.

Title I Input:

Amount approved - $24,272.00
Personnel - 1 director
1 educational assistant

State Input:

Amount approved - approximately $30,000.00
Personnel - 3 clinician teachers
No. of students to be served - 105

2. STATE CATEGORICAL FUNDS

State categorical funds provide four types of programs specifically for the educationally disadvantaged. These are described briefly in the accompanying pages. These programs are operated by the Compensatory Education Section, as is Title I. A summary of funding and beneficiaries of all State and federally funded programs operated by this office (See Table 7) and program descriptions of other compensatory programs are included.

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF FUNDING AND BENEFICIARIES

Project	Funding						1969-70 Estimates	
	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	Total	Beneficiaries	Target Group
Special Motivation	47,360	47,040	48,310	4,000[a]	0[a]	146,710	732[b]	2,817[c]
Headstart	679,300	551,526	652,924	650,299	320,704	2,854,753	627	1,944
Follow Through	0	0	92,371	168,482	253,379	514,232	500	1,440
N Y C	640,610	368,000	326,408	501,800	411,671	2,248,489	875	2,912
Act IV	235,513	250,708	226,741	271,951	422,034	1,406,947	2,711[d]	4,166
ESEA Title I	2,374,944	2,108,762	2,226,608	2,048,479	2,606,146	11,364,939	7,874	13,476[e]
Model Cities	0	0	0	0	783,091	783,091[g]	3,711	63,900[f]
Act 299	0	0	0	0	137,000	137,000	2,371	2,371
Dropout	0	0	0	109,110	506,485	615,595	791	4,889
TOTAL	3,977,727	3,326,036	3,573,362	3,754,121	5,440,510	20,071,756	20,192	97,905

a Currently State General Fund
b Estimate of 61 per class per year, based on McKinley data
c Estimate of 8% of grade 10-12 enrollment
d Because of overlapping services, projects claim 6808 beneficiaries, of whom 6105 are HHL residents' children
e Number of children in families receiving public welfare support, 1969
f Total population of Model Neighborhood Areas
g Only $35,251 actually received, January 1970

ACT 125, SLH 1961, SPECIAL MOTIVIATION PROGRAM

Program Description:

This 1961 enactment established a pilot work-experience program designated the Special Motivation Program in 1965 in an attempt to combat "the dropout problem by providing the unmotivated potential dropout extra supportive help through group and individual guidance, tutoring, moditied curricula and modified scheduling. The program attempts to assist the unmotivated potential dropout who has re-entered school.

The responsibility tor the administration ot this program was first vested in the Special Education Branch, but was recently transferred to the Compensatory Education Section as a component ot the Statewide Dropout Program. Responsibility for maintaining and operating the program is assumed by the Districts.

Appropriation for the Special Motivation Program is made by the Hawaii State Legislature.

During the 1969-70 school term, the Districts reported 16 Special Motivation Classes.

ACT IV OF 1965

Program Description:

This amendment to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act ot 1920 provides State funds for projects developed for the educational improvement ot the children ot the residents ot Hawaiian Home Lands.

The primary focus of this act is upon the educational improvement ot children residing on the Hawaiian Home Lands who are enrolled in the preschool and elementary grades of both public and private schools. Hawaiian Home Lands resident children attending secondary school als o receive help under this act.

The overall responsibility tor developing and administering the educational projects funded by this act lies with the Department of Education. The act requires consultation with the University ot Hawaii and the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands but sets no formal procedure for implementation of projects. A special advisory council has been established to assist the Department in this responsibility.

Act IV authorizes the Department of Education to draw, with prior written approval of the Governor, upon a special account set up within the Hawaiian Home Development (Loan) Fund tor educational projects.

ACT 299, SLH 1967, PROGRESSIVE NEIGHBORHOODS PROGRAM

Program Description:

The purpose of this Act is "to initiate on an exemplary and demonstration basis remedial action to alleviate conditions contributing to a composite problem area by concerted program to supplement public resources in such an area and to attempt new solutions through reallocation of present resources."

Part III of this Act concerns the educational needs in disadvantaged areas. The purposes listed under this section are:

a. To allow for more effective use of education programs in multi-problem neighborhoods and
b. To provide for exemplary and demonstration school programs in progressive neighborhoods which could serve as models for other neighborhoods and schools.

Act 299 provides for the development originally of Nanakuli-Maili-Waianae-Makaha areas through additional resources from the State.

Responsibility for the administration of this program rests with the chief executive officer of the State. A Task Force which includes the Superintendent of Education assists the Governor.

STATEWIDE DROPOUT PROGRAM

Program Description:

The purpose of the program is the minimize the number of dropouts through early identification and preventative services. The program is also intended to provide services to actual dropouts, encouraging return and/or assisting them to continue their educational and occupational preparation through other avenues.

In the fall of 1969, about 800 youths, grades 5-12, received direct services. Another 426 were identified as potential beneficiaries. A projection of the statewide dropouts and potential dropout numbers in secondary schools showed 5,000 youths to be of direct concern to the program.

Program services in 1969-70 were offered by a staff of 19 detached counselors, 8 outreach aides, and nearly 100 teachers as part-time advisors. Program components are:

The Identification and Reporting System
Counseling and Guidance Services
Work-Study
Cultural-Motivational Activities
In-Service Training for Staff
Tutorial and Remedial Instruction

The program is guided by one program specialist of the Compensatory Education Branch, Department of Education. The program is offered in each of the seven school districts, with staft serving one or more schools. Concentration is on the intermediate and high school level.

VII. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

A review was made of the amount of participation by students from non-public schools in the Title I projects during the 1969-70 school year. This review was prompted by the complaints received from the parochial school officials that services were not being extended to their deprived students.

Several meetings were held with the non-public school officials to ascertain the background of their complaints and to explore with them ways of increasing services to their students. The non-public school officials were invited to all ot the Title I discussion meetings and workshops that were conducted by the State agency. The district personnel were reminded about the requirement that non-public school officials were to be included in the planning and evaluation ot the projects.

There has been noted a general reluctance on the part of the public school officials to include non-public school students in programs supported by public tunds. This atmosphere has been fostered in part by the State laws which prohibit use ot public tunds tor private school students and in part by the views of the general community. It will take some time to re-educate the school personnel and the community to the requirements ot the Title I program.

There has been an improvement on this matter of participation of deprived students trom non-public schools in Title I projects. In the regular school term of 1969-70, there were 132 children from non-public schools participating in only three projects. These projects were approved in August, 1969, prior to the initiation of the review and discussions with non-public school officials. But tor the 1970 summer term, a total of 140 students from non-public schools were included in eleven projects. The summer projects in which these non-public school children participated included a variety of academic and outdoor activities.

The district and school Title I personnel will be reminded to extend their efforts to include deprived students attending non-public schools in their projects.

VIII. TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE TRAINING

All districts carried out some form of staff training during the year, both in the regular school year and in the summer. In some cases, professionals and paraprofessionals received separate training sessions, but six of seven districts did provide joint training opportunities. These joint sessions were primarily for orientation purposes and were ot less than one

week (full-time equivalency) in duration. (See Table 8) Six districts provided orientation during the regular school year, and four did so during the summer. A total of 433 persons received orientation in the regular term and 169 in the summer. (See Table 9)

One district provided a joint training workshop of greater than one week (full-time equivalency) duration, and this was during the summer.

While all staff training efforts were satisfactory, none of the joint training ventures are felt to be outstanding. Thus, no examples are offered this year. Future improvements are expected.

TABLE

Number of Persons Trained - 1970 Summer Term

DISTRICT	PROFESSIONALS ALONE				PARA-PROFESSIONALS ALONE				BOTH PROFESSIONALS AND PARA-PROFESSIONALS			
	Total Employed	Number trained*			Total Employed	Number trained			Total Employed	Number trained		
		Orientation	Workshop	College credit		Orientation	Workshop	College credit		Orientation	Workshop	College credit
Honolulu	127	10	-	54	10	-	24	-	137	57	-	-
Leeward	52	-	25	-	14	-	-	-	66	25	-	-
Central	11	-	7	-	0	-	-	-	11	-	-	-
Windward	47	-	-	93	1	-	-	-	48	40	-	-
Hawaii	29	-	20	-	11	3	-	-	40	-	42	-
Maui	19	14	-	-	4	2	-	-	23	5	-	-
Kauai	0	2	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	-
Total	285	26	52	147	40	5	24	0	325	127	42	0

* The training categories used refer to type and duration. Orientations are less than one week, full time equivalency. Workshops are of one week or greater duration. College credit courses are of unspecified duration that carry at least 3 quarter credits from University of Hawaii.

TABLE

Number of Persons Trained - Regular School Year

DISTRICT	PROFESSIONALS ALONE				PARA-PROFESSIONALS ALONE				BOTH PROFESSIONALS AND PARA-PROFESSIONALS			
	Total Employed	Number trained*			Total Employed	Number trained			Total Employed	Number trained		
		Orientation	Workshop	College credit		Orientation	Workshop	College credit		Orientation	Workshop	College credit
Honolulu	60	-	-	-	32	-	-	-	92	201	-	-
Leeward	13	1	-	-	6	-	-	-	19	93	-	-
Central	6	1	-	-	9	-	-	-	15	15	-	-
Windward	16	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	26	16	-	-
Hawaii	9	-	-	-	40	-	-	-	49	92	-	-
Maui	9	2	-	-	7	-	-	-	16	16	-	-
Kauai	10	4	-	-	4	2	-	-	14	-	-	-
Total	123	8	0	0	108	2	0	0	231	433**	0	0

* The training categories used refer to type and duration. Orientations are less than one week, full time equivalency. Workshops are of one week or greater duration. College credit courses are of unspecified duration that carry at least 3 quarter credits from University of Hawaii.

** Includes training of unpaid para-professionals who assist projects.

IX. COMMUNITY-PARENT INVOLVEMENT

NATURE AND EXTENT

The community and parent involvement component of the Title I programs in this State has not yet been fully developed. Although many cases of parent involvement can be cited, these cases are generally limited to visiting of projects for information or culminating activities, assisting teachers in implementing the program, evaluating projects to the extent of answering questionnaires, or participating in Compensatory Education workshops with some planning input; no one project has a written plan that includes serious inputs at all levels--the planning, implementation and evaluation levels.

While awaiting the revised Federal guidelines on parent-community involvement, the Compensatory Education Section has adopted the following guidelines for the State in order to insure more comprehensive involvement:

> "The application should describe how the parents were consulted and involved in the planning of the Title I project. It should also describe how the parents will be consulted and involved in the operation and evaluation of that project.
>
> "The participating parents must (1) be identified as being representative of the parents of the children in the project, (2) be fully informed of the district concerning the purposes and requirements of Title I and the resources available under various programs to meet the needs of educationally deprived children, (3) have had adequate opportunities to discuss the needs of educationally deprived children with teachers, administrators and representatives of other agencies having knowledge of such needs and (4) have had adequate opportunities to consider and make recommendations on the activities and services set forth in the application."

EXAMPLE OF INVOLVEMENT

Because the Alae Project is a live-in project and because the community from which the children come is the target area of other projects, it probably has the greatest parent-community involvement component in the State. Parents in the project visit the children, volunteer to assist on excursions, occasionally spend the night with the children and receive assistance from project personnel to insure carryover of learning in nutrition from school to the home.

Questions on this report should be addressed to the Superintendent of Education, Department of Education, State of Hawaii.

APPENDIX A

School Attitude Inventory

SCHOOL ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Name:_____ School:_____

Grade:_____ Date:_____

INSTRUCTIONS:

Fill out the blanks above with your name, grade, school, and today's date. Do this now.

On the following pages you will find 30 statements about what you think and how you feel about school. Read each statement very carefully, and then decide how much each statement is like you or not like you. Then check your answer on the space provided under each statement.

This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer honestly so that your teachers and counselors will be able to understand you better and help you more with your problems. Your answers will not in any way affect your grades in school.

EXAMPLE 1

I love school.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

If you love school, mark an "X" on the line above "very much like me." If you do not love school, mark an "X" on the line above "not like me". If the statement is slightly like you or quite like you, then mark an "X" on the line above your answer. Mark your answer now.

EXAMPLE 2

I don't like playing in school.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

If you don't like playing in school, then your answer should be "very much like me." But if you like playing in school, your answer should be "not like me." If your answer is somewhere in-between, mark an "X" on the line above your answer. Do it now. Are there any questions? If none, then turn the page over and begin.

1. I can work alone for a period of time.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

2. I complete my work not finished the day before.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

3. I do my school assignments regularly.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

4. I read without anybody telling me to.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

5. I enjoy books, newspapers, and magazines.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

6. I carry out my activities until they are finished.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

7. I easily get distracted from study by things going on around me.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

8. I know that I can do what the teacher wants me to do.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

9. I am interested in the results of my work.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

10. I stick with a job until finished.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

11. I like most of my teachers.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

12. I don't feel like doing school work.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

13. I come to school regularly.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

14. I do extra school work.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

15. I hate school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

16. I get right down to work if I have studying to do.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

17. I usually get my classwork in early.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

18. In class I often look out the window or at things around the room.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

19. I find learning new things interesting.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

20. I like to go to school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

21. I think school is fun.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

22. I think school work is useless.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

23. I would like to leave school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

24. I am doing well in school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

25. It's nice to be in school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

26. I think teachers give us too much work.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

27. I think school is like a prison.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

28. I think teachers are not interested in me.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

29. I think school is important.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

30. School is unpleasant.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

APPENDIX B

Abstract of Approved Projects

TITLE I, P. L. 89-10

SUMMARIES OF APPROVED PROJECTS

FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

(1969-70 SCHOOL YEAR)

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION SECTION

NOVEMBER, 1970

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

TITLE I, ESEA

1969-1970

DISTRICT ALLOCATIONS

HONOLULU	$ 1,252,889
CENTRAL OAHU	197,425
LEEWARD OAHU	276,994
WINDWARD OAHU	276,994
HAWAII	356,742
MAUI	149,275
KAUAI	95,828
TOTALS	$ 2,606,146

TITLE I, P. L. 89-10

APPROVED PROJECTS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1970

SPECIAL PROJECT FOR CHILDREN IN INSTITUTIONS
FOR DELINQUENT CHILDREN

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	REGULAR TERM	TOTAL
21	Windward Oahu	$12,000	$12,000

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
21	Windward Oahu Olomana Gr. 7-12	AN EDUCATIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM FOR DELINQUENT ADOLESCENTS - The proposed project will seek to provide additional educational materials and equipment to develop a highly individualized structure for instruction. Provisions will be made to include self-instructional or automated learning. Reinforcement principles and contingency management techniques will be applied. A system for immediate reinforcement and recognition of successful achievement at any level of desired behavior will be implemented. The consulting services of the University of Hawaii Youth Development Center will be used. Amount Approved: $12,000 (Amended to $9,000) Personnel: Existing assigned personnel will be used. No. of Children to be Served: 53

G69-241E-475-4-206

TITLE I, P.L. 89-10

APPROVED PROJECTS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1970

COMPREHENSIVE PROJECTS
(Guidance, Compensatory, Remedial)

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	REGULAR TERM	TOTAL
24	Honolulu	$249,074	$249,074
25	Honolulu	108,476	108,476
26	Honolulu	341,218	341,218
	Totals	$698,768	$698,768

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
24	Honolulu McKinley High Central Inter. Washington Inter. Kaahumanu Kaiulani Lanakila Likelike Royal Linekona Gr. K-12 Compensatory Remedial Guidance	DECREASING SCHOOL ALIENATION PROJECT - McKINLEY COMPLEX - This project has been designed to provide the following: a. An expanded curriculum to overcome cultural impoverishment, enhance motivation, widen the horizon of pupils and include activities which are aimed at compensating for early experimental deficits, especially those of language arts and cognitive development. b. A highly specialized rehabilitative educational center for students who have been unable to profit from the regular program of instruction because of emotional and/or behavioral problems and other manifestations of conflict with school achievement. c. The development of materials to involve the disadvantaged child, to extend his cognitive development, and needed remedial assistance. d. An articulated program of instruction which will aim at a common and concerted program approach in schools serving in particular pockets of poverty. e. A school climate which will be conducive to the implementation of needed curricular modifications and adaptations. The activities provided in this project include: a. Adjustment class b. Outdoor education c. Educational assessment team d. Modified curriculum classes e. Counseling and guidance services Amount Approved: $249,074 Personnel: 11 Educational Assistants (Full time) 8 Elementary Teachers (Full time) 3 Modified Curriculum Teachers (Full time) 4 Counselors (Full time) 1 Counselor (Half time) 1 Coordinator (Part time) 2 Consultants (Part time) 7 Activities Advisors (Part time) No. of Students to be Served: 825 G69-233E-731-1-18111

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
25	Honolulu Palolo Anuenue Jarrett Inter. Kaimuki High Gr. K-12 Remedial Compensatory Guidance	DECREASING SCHOOL ALIENATION PROJECT - KAIMUKI COMPLEX - This project has been designed to provide an expanded curriculum, a specialized rehabilitative educational center for school alienated pupils with emotional and/or behavioral problems, the development of materials to involve the disadvantaged child, an articulated program of instruction and a school climate that promotes needed curricular modifications and adaptations. The activities to be provided include an adjustment class, outdoor education, an educational assessment team, modified curriculum classes, counseling and guidance services, "Life Adjustment" activities, and student activities. Amount Approved: $108,476 Personnel: 3 Educational Assistants (Full time) 3 Elementary Adjustment/Motivation Teachers (Full time) 2 Secondary Adjustment/Motivation Teachers (Full time) 3 Counselors (Full time) 2 Counselors (Half time) No. of Students to be Served: 358 G69-233E-731-1-18111

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
26	Honolulu Farrington High Dole Intermediate Kalakaua Inter. Fern Kaewai Kalihi Kalihi-kai Kalihi-waena Linapuni Puuhale Gr. K-12 Compensatory Remedial Guidance	DECREASING SCHOOL ALIENATION - FARRINGTON COMPLEX - The objectives of this project are: a. To raise the achievement level of educationally disadvantaged students in basic education. b. To improve the holding power of school and minimize the number of cases of truancy, class cutting, absences, and dropouts. In accord with these objectives, this project is designed to provide an expanded curriculum, a highly specialized rehabilitative educational center for school alienated students, development of materials involving the disadvantaged child, an articulated program of instruction and a school climate that will be conducive to the implementation of needed curricular modifications and adaptations. Activities that are provided for in this project include an adjustment class, outdoor education, an educational assessment team, modified curriculum classes, and counseling and guidance services. Amount Approved: $341,218 Personnel: 13 Educational Assistants (Full time) 6 Elementary Language Development Teachers (Full time) 1 Life Adjustment Teacher (Full time) 8 Modified Curriculum Teachers (Full time) 2 Educational Assessment Team Members (Full time) 1 Educational Assessment Team Member (Half time) 2 Counselors (Full time) 1 Counselor (Half time) 1 Coordinator (Part time) 2 Consultants (Part time) No. of Students to be Served: 1,124 G69-233E-731-1-18111

TITLE I, P. L. 89-10

APPROVED PROJECTS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1970

COMPENSATORY PROJECTS

REGULAR TERM

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	TOTAL
1	Hawaii	$ 215,110
7	Kauai	10,631
10	Leeward Oahu	36,553
12	Leeward Oahu	54,308
18	Windward Oahu	16,931
19	Maui	35,498
23	Honolulu	98,838
27	Honolulu	15,509
30	Honolulu	36,000
		$ 519,369

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
1	Hawaii Kapiolani Hilo High Konawaena High Kealakehe Holualoa Konawaena Elem. Keaukaha Hookena Naalehu Laupahoehoe High Paauilo Inter. Pahoa High Gr. PreK-12 Compensatory	COMPENSATORY PROJECT - This project provides for the following activities: a. English Team Teaching b. Field trips and excursions c. Expansion of educational resource centers d. Individualization of instruction e. Expansion of library services f. Experiences to broaden the children's knowledge of the community g. Experiences to build the child's self-image. h. Parental involvement in school programs. i. Broadening the counseling services. j. Experiences in oral language development Amount Approved: $215,110 Personnel: 1 Director, Reading Clinic (Full time) 2 Elementary Teachers (Full time) 25 Educational Assistants (Full time) 1 Library Assistant (Full time) 1 Stenographer (Full time) 1 Stenographer (Part time) 1 Cook (Part time) 1 Dorm Attendant (Part time) 2 Tutors (Part time) No. of Students to be Served: 1,359 G69-233E-735-5-18150

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
18	Windward Oahu Waiahole Gr. Pre-K Compensatory	PRE-KINDERGARTEN FOR DISADVANTAGED 4 YEAR OLDS - This is a continuation project. It is designed to continue with a regular Head Start pre-school and emphasize fostering of language arts skills. The project will consist of play experiences, flexibly arranged, where children can learn as they play with materials and share experiences with their peers and adults. Lunch services and cultural exposure through excursions and field trips are included. Amount Approved: $16,931 Personnel: 1 Pre-School Teacher (Full time) 1 Educational Assistant (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 20 G69-233E-734-4-18142

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
19	Maui Hana Haiku Kamehameha III Gr. Pre-K Compensatory	COMPENSATORY-HEAD START PROJECT - This project is designed to provide experiences that will allow the educationally deprived children to begin the regular school programs on moe equal terms with their more fortunate classmates. The project will provide a curriculum rich in first-hand and multi-sensory experiences to develop positive self-image, language, basic skills and the ability to solve problems. Two of the sub-projects will be implemented in the second semester. Amount Approved: $35,498 Personnel: 1 PreSchool Teacher (Full time) 2 PreSchool Teachers (Full time - Second Semester) 1 Educational Assistant (Full time) 2 Educational Assistants (Full time - Second Semester) No. of Students to be Served: 45 G69-233E-736-6-18160

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
7	Kauai Hanalei Gr. Pre-K Compensatory	PRE-SCHOOL EXPERIENCE PROJECT FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED - This is a continuation project. It is a full-time full-year project. The major emphasis will be to provide the children from economically disadvantaged families with the kinds of experiences that will enable them to succeed in the regular school program. Carefully planned field trips as well as other enriching experiences are to be included. Amount Approved: $10,631 Personnel: 1 Pre-School Teacher (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 14 G69-233E-737-7-18172

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
10	Leeward Oahu Maili Elem. Waianae Elem. Gr. K-6 Compensatory	COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED - This project provides for the following components: a. Reading and health education activities at the elementary level. b. A Supplementary Instructional Materials Center to concentrate on servicing the educationally deprived children at Waianae Elementary School. Amount Approved: $36,553 Personnel: 1 Elementary Reading Teacher (Full time) 1 Elementary Health Teacher (Full time) 1 Teacher, Media Specialist (Full time) 1 Stenographer (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 122 G69-233E-733-3-18130

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
12	Leeward Oahu Nanaikapono Waianae Elem. Gr. Pre-K Compensatory	PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED - This is a continuation project. It is designed to provide early school experience for the culturally different youngsters. The program will constitute teachers, teacher aides, a nurse's aide and a nurse. Health education plays an important role in the total program of the pre-school age child. Amount Approved: $54,308 Personnel: 2 Preschool Teachers (Full time) 1 Nurse (Full time) 1 Social Worker (Full time) 2 Educational Assistants (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 40 G69-233E-733-3-18133

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
23	Honolulu Fern Kaewai Kalihi Kalihi-kai Kalihi-waena Lanakila Royal Gr. 1-3 Compensatory	COMPENSATORY EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROJECT - The Early Childhood Education Project is a continuation of the project initiated during the 1968-69 school year. It provides for an instructional and organizational method within grades 1-3 in which a third teacher is assigned to a teaching situation where two are nor normally assigned. This complements the State Department of Education's attempt in implementing the "3 on 2" demonstration project. Seven schools will be involved in the implementation of this project. Amount Approved: $98,838 Personnel: 11 Primary Grade Teachers No. of Students to be Served: 220 G69-233E-731-1-18110

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
27	Honolulu Likelike Gr. Pre-K Compensatory	LIKELIKE PRESCHOOL PROJECT - This is a continuation project and is designed to provide experiences for educationally deprived children to enable them to enter kindergarten on a more equal footing with their peers. The program will emphasize playground activities, classroom activities, and carefully planned field trips for the twenty participants. Amount Approved: $15,500 Personnel: 1 Preschool Teacher (Full time) 1 Educational Assistant (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 20 G69-233E-731-1-18112

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
30	Honolulu Palolo Lanakila	PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH - A special project for children who have participated in Headstart Project classes. Title I funds are to supplement the regular project funds in providing the participating children an enriched type innovative learning situation. Amount Approved: $36,000 Personnel: 3 Teachers 2 Educational Assistants No. of Children to be served: 456 G-69-233-E-730-9-18181

TITLE I, P.L. 89-10

APPROVED PROJECTS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1970

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING PROJECTS

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	REGULAR TERM	SUMMER	TOTAL
3	Hawaii	$27,875		$27,875
4	Central Oahu	38,264		38,264
8	Kauai	28,320		28,320
11	Leeward Oahu	19,906		19,906
14	Maui	12,392		12,392
17	Windward Oahu	60,300		60,300
	Totals	$187,057		$187,057

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
4	Central Oahu Aiea High Waialua High & Elem. Gr. 8-12 Counseling Guidance	COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PROJECT TO REDUCE SCHOOL ALIENATION - This is a continuation project. At Aiea High School this project provides for a counseling and guidance program with slight modifications for a classroom program with stipends for behavior modification. This project at both schools is to provide experiences which will assist in improving the self-image of the students selected. Experiences such as field trips, excursions, camping trips, resource speakers will be used together with planned learning and guidance activities as well as intensive counseling sessions to achieve the project objectives. Amount Approved: $38,264 Personnel: Aiea High School 1 Secondary Teacher (Full time) 1 Counselor (Full time) 1 Educational Assistant (Half time) Waialua High School 1 Counselor (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 75 G69-233E-732-2-18121

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
8	Kauai Kapaa High & Inter. Kalaheo Mobile Class Waimea Kapaa Elem. Kapaa High Gr. 3-12 Guidance	COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PROGRAM FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED - This project provides for three components: a. Student Counseling and Home-School Liaison b. Mobile Class c. Project Rejuvenation The first two components are continued from the previous school year while "Project Rejuvenation" is to be initiated during the 1969-70 school year. The objective of this project including all the components is to decrease school alienation in the elementary as well as in the secondary grades. The emphasis will be the same as for the previous year -- to establish meaningful guidance and counseling experiences for the educationally deprived youngsters. Amount Approved: $28,320 Personnel: 2 Secondary Teacher-Advisors (Full time) 1 Counselor-Social Worker (Half time) 1 Coordinator (Part time) 2 Elementary Teacher-Advisors (Part time) 2 Secondary Teacher-Advisors (Part time) No. of Students to be Served: 103 G69-233E-737-7-18171

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
14	Maui Lahainaluna Gr. 9-12 Guidance	GUIDANCE-COUNSELING PROJECT - This project is to provide counseling services for the educationally disadvantaged secondary students. The objectives of this project are to improve student attitudes toward school and to raise the educational and occupational expectations of the students. Amount Approved: $12,392 Personnel: 1 Counselor (Full time) G69-233E-736-6-18163

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
11	Leeward Oahu Makaha Gr. 1-3 Guidance	GUIDANCE PROGRAM FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED - This project is designed to provide counseling and health services to eligible youngsters. These areas are vital to the in-school educational program and provides meaningful experiences to those in need of such services. Emphasis will focus on the preventive aspects through early identification and follow up. Amount Approved: $19,906 Personnel: 1 Counselor (Full time) 1 Health Teacher (Full time) G69-233E-733-3-18132

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
17	Windward Oahu Castle High Waiahole Hauula Kaaawa Kahaluu Laie Gr. PreK-12 Counseling Guidance	COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PROGRAM FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED - Projects involve counseling services to eligible participants. Decreasing school alienation in the elementary as well as in the secondary grades will be the focus of the counselors. Stress will be upon early referral and individual and group counseling techniques will be used. Efforts to develop meaningful working relationship with parents will be intensified. Amount Approved: $60,300 Personnel: 4 Counselors (Full time) 1 Counselor (4/5 time) 1 Counselor (1/5 time) 1 Educational Assistant (Half time) No. of Students to be Served: 276 G69-233E-734-4-18141

TITLE I, P.L. 89-10

APPROVED PROJECTS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1970

REMEDIAL PROJECTS

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	REGULAR TERM	SUMMER	TOTAL
2	Hawaii	$ 40,415		$ 40,415
5	Central Oahu	88,573		88,573
6	Kauai	31,871		31,871
9	Leeward Oahu	69,517		69,517
13	Maui	53,736		53,736
15	Maui	8,797		8,797
16	Windward Oahu	107,053		107,053
	Totals	$399,962		$399,962

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
2	Hawaii District Hilo High Hilo Inter. Honaunau Keaukaha Gr. K-12 Remedial	REMEDIAL PROJECT - This project has been developed to provide the necessary experiences for the educationally deprived students that will enable them to develop adequate academic skills. Methods to be used include small group remedial reading instruction, use of individualized instructional materials, exposure to cultural experiences, health, dental and counseling services and speech and hearing activities. Amount Approved: $40,415 Personnel: 1 Nurse (Full time) 3 Educational Assistants (Full time) 3 Educational Assistants (Half time) 1 Clerk (Part time) 1 Tutor (Part time) No. of Students to be Served: 352 G69-233E-735-5-18151

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
5	Central Oahu Haleiwa Halawa Wahiawa Waialua Aiea Aiea Inter. Gr. K-7 Remedial	REMEDIAL AND MODIFIED CURRICULUM - This is a continuation project. The activities provided center around remedial and developmental instruction on the language arts, with some emphasis on the social studies at the elementary and intermediate levels. Amount Approved: $88,573 Personnel: 2 Elementary Teachers (Full time) 1 Secondary Reading Teacher (Full time) 8 Educational Assistants (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 327 G69-233E-732-2-18120

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
6	Kauai Kapaa Elementary Koloa Waimea Gr. K-6 Remedial	LANGUAGE ARTS REMEDIATION PROJECT - This is a continuing project. All remedial activities proposed are focused upon the language arts. Specifically, the activities are centered on the development of reading skills. Amount Approved: $31,871 Personnel: 1 Elementary Teacher (Full time) 4 Educational Assistants (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 107 G69-233E-733-3-18131

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
13	Maui Kilohana Paia Waihee Kihei Kula Wailuku Gr. K-8 Remedial	REMEDIAL-LANGUAGE ARTS PROJECT - This is a continuing project. But for the 1969-70 school year, the emphasis has been limited to language arts. Various approaches will be utilized among which will be included small group instructon, remedial reading activities, counseling and guidance services, tutorial services and individualizing instruction. The objective, which is in accord with that of the State, is to improve the achievmeent and skills of the participating students in language arts. Amount Approved: $53,736 Personnel: 3 Elementary Teachers (Full time) 4 Educational Assistants (Full time) 1 Tutor (Part time) No. of Students to be Served: 193 G69-233E-736-6-18161

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
15	Maui Maui High Gr. 9-12 Remedial	REMEDIAL-MODIFIED CURRICULUM - This project is designed to provide a modified English-Social Studies Program for the educationally disadvantaged secondary students. The English and Social Studies Program will be modified into a core program to coordinate the language arts instruction with social studies. It will be possible to assess the needs of the students on an individual basis. This in turn will enable teachers to do corrective and developmental teaching. Amount Approved: $8,797 Personnel: 1 Secondary Teacher (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 117 G69-233E-736-6-18162

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
9	Leeward Oahu Waianae High Nanakuli High & Int. Waianae Inter. Nanaikapono Gr. 1-2 Gr. 7-12 Remedial	REMEDIAL EDUCATION FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED - This is a continuation project except that Nanakuli High School is changing to the "Fader" activity from the "Off campus community classroom" that was tried last school year. Among the other activities that are to be continued include the following: a. A language arts team to service an elementary school. b. A modified curriculum of English, reading and social studies at an intermediate school. c. A modified curriculum using educational assistants at a high school. Amount Approved: $69,517 Personnel: 2 Elementary Teachers (Full time) 2 Secondary Teachers (Full time) 4 Educational Assistants (Full time) 1 Stenographer (Full time) No. of Students to be Served: 218 G69-233E-733-3-18131

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
16	Windward Oahu Castle High Kahuku High Hauula Pope Kaaawa Waimanalo Kahaluu Parker Laie Gr. K-12 Remedial	REMEDIAL AND MODIFIED CURRICULUM FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED - This is a continuation project. Project activities center around remedial instruction in the language arts for the elementary and the modified curriculum, in the language arts and the social sciences for the secondary. Basic intent of services will be to provide more individual and small group attention to the deprived youngsters. Continuing programs will place special emphasis on improving language skills. Amount Approved: $107,053 Personnel: 2 Secondary Teachers (Full time) 1 Secondary Teachers (Half time) 6 Elementary Teachers (Full time) 1 Library Assistant (Full time) 1 Educational Assistant (Full time) 6 Educational Assistant (Half time) No. of Students to be Served: 494 G69-233E-734-4-18140

TITLE I, P.L. 89-10

APPROVED PROJECTS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1970

AUXILIARY PROJECTS

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	REGULAR TERM	SUMMER	REGULAR & SUMMER	TOTAL
22	Honolulu			$20,500	$20,500

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
22	Honolulu Project Coordination Auxiliary	DISTRICT COORDINATION - The Coordination will assist the District Superintendent in administering and supervising all Title I projects in the Honolulu District, coordinate all evaluations, be responsible for public relations, work closely with the Community Action Programs, and set up a working relationship with private and public school officials. In this continuing project, the Coordinator's position will be funded by the State. There will be 23 schools serviced by the Coordinator. Emphasis will focus on in-service training for personnel involved. Amount Approved: $20,500 Personnel: 1 Steno (Full time) 1 Clerk (Full time) 1 Student Help (Part time) 2 Consultants (Part time) Other Expenses: Equipment Supplies and Materials G69-233E-73[illegible]-1-18113

TITLE I, P. L. 89-10

APPROVED PROJECTS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1970

SUMMER PROJECTS

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	TOTAL
29	Maui	$ 5,574
29	Hawaii	17,372
31	Windward Oahu	6,083
32	Windward Oahu	20,157
33	Windward Oahu	6,100
34	Hawaii	20,476
35	Hawaii	7,295
36	Hawaii	5,994
37	Hawaii	4,980
38	Hawaii	9,501
39	Hawaii	2,232
40	Hawaii	7,212
41	Hawaii	3,548
42	Honolulu	52,890
43	Honolulu	57,752
44	Honolulu	131,935
45	Kauai	1,000
46	Honolulu	3,027
47	Central Oahu	2,738

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	TOTAL
48	Central Oahu	$ 31,220
49	Leeward Oahu	10,775
50	Leeward Oahu	4,500
51	Leeward Oahu	5,218
52	Leeward Oahu	4,222
53	Maui	5,951
54	Maui	2,081
55	Maui	2,592
56	Hawaii	706
57	Windward Oahu	17,550
58	Windward Oahu	11,454
59	Leeward Oahu	750
60	Leeward Oahu	40,557
61	Leeward Oahu	5,025
62	Maui	2,539
63	Maui	7,059
		$ 518,065

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
20	Maui Makawao Gr. 1-3 Compensatory	COMPENSATORY - SUMMER SCHOOL PROJECT - This project is designed to focus on a summer school setting where selected students will be provided with a language arts orientation. The emphasis will be upon improving the oral language of the educationally deprived children. Amount Approved: $5,574 Personnel: 6 Elementary Teachers (Full Summer School Term) No. of Students to be Served: 30 G69-233E-736-6-18164

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
29	Hawaii	Operation SCOPE (Summer Camp and Outdoor Participation Education)
	Konawaena High Kealakehe Holualoa Honaunau Hookena Naalehu Pahoa Kapiolani Laupahoehoe Paauilo	A program involving academic work and outdoor activities will be provided selected students from eligible Title I schools. There will be planned recreation including organized athletics that will assist the boys participating in the project to adjust themselves to the regular schools. Amount approved: $17,372 Dates: a. May 25 - July 31, 1970 b. Aug.3 - 28, 1970 Personnel: 1 Coordinator 1 Teacher 1 Counselor 2 Dorm Attendants 1 Work Supervisor 1 Cook No. of children to be served: 270

G69233E-735-5-18158

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NUMBER	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
31	Windward Oahu Pope	FREE SUMMER SCHOOL An individualized instructional program will be offered the students participating in the program that will best meet their needs. A diagnostic prescriptive method will be used and the academic and social needs of the children will be assessed. The instructional program will be planned for each child and the learning center will be utilized to facilitate independent study. Amount approved: $6,083 Dates: June 22-July 31, 1970 Personnel: 32 teachers No. of children to be served: 75 G69233E-734-4-18143
32	Windward Kahuku High Laie Hauula Kaawa	BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS AND MODIFICATION: PRECISION TEACHING TECHNIQUES PRACTICUM A summer school program to provide participating students individualized instruction in mathematics and language arts. Each student's level of achievement will be considered in developing the instructional program. Amount approved: $20,157 Dates: June 15 - July 24, 1970 Personnel: 1 Coordinator 5 Supervisors 1 Media Specialist 50 Teachers 1 Clerk 3 Custodians (Part time) 3 Student Helpers No. of children to be served: 250 G69233E-734-4-18144

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
33	Windward Oahu Olomana Gr.7-12	BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION THROUGH ART, MUSIC AND RECREATION A six hour per day summer program for the wards of the Hawaii Youth Correctional Center attending Olomana School. The focus of the instructional program will be on art, music and recreation to provide opportunities for the students to develop their talents and to achieve in areas other than academic, and through recognition of their talents to assist them in developing better social behavior patterns. Amount approved: $6,100 Dates: July 6 - August 14, 1970 Personnel: 3 Teachers 2 Educational Assistants 1 Coordinator No. of children to be served: 60 G69233E-475-4-20601

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
34	Hawaii Hilo High	OPERATION HILO (Helping Individuals to Learn about Occupations) A pilot project designed to provide school alienated youth with work study opportunities and intense counseling. Field trips to various shops, hotels and industrial concerns will be arranged to provide the participants with an orientation to the many occupational opportunities available. Amount approved: $20,476 Dates: June 15 - July 31, 1970 Personnel: 3 Counselor-Coordinators 3 Community Aides No. of children to be served: 15 G-69233E-735-5--18053
35	Hawaii Hilo Inter. Waiakea Inter. St. Joseph Kalanianaole	OPERATION COPE (Crafts, Outdoors and Physical Education) The students selected from the intermediate schools will be involved in a program designed to provide them with opportunities to learn various indoor and outdoor sports, crafts and outdoor skills. Counseling will be provided to assist the students to better adjust themselves to the regular school program. Amount approved: $7,295 Dates: June 15 - August 7, 1970 Personnel: 1 Director 3 Teachers 5 Specialists (Part Time) 3 Student Helpers No. of children to be served: 70 G69233E-735-5-18157

SUMMER PROJECTS

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
36	Hawaii Kealakehe Holualoa Konawaena Elem. Hanannau Hookena Naalehu Pahoa Kapiolani St.Joseph Laupahoehoe Paauilo	OPERATION VSC (Volcano Summer Camp) This project is designed to provide selected students from the eligible Title I elementary schools with cultural and educationally enriching experiences in a camp setting. Counseling will be provided the children to assist them in improving their attitudes toward the regular school program. Amount approved: $5,994 Dates: August 3 - 28, 1970 Personnel: 1 Coordinator 1 Teacher 2 Student Counselors 1 Custodian 1 Bus Driver 1 Cook No. of children to be served: 100 G69233E-735-5-18155
37	Hawaii Waiakea Int. St. Joseph	OPERATION PSA (Prevention of School Alienation) This project is to provide selected students from eligible Title I schools with opportunities to improve their reading skills in an integrated language experience program. Arrangements will be made to provide the children with experiences in music, practical arts and crafts on a voluntary basis. Amount approved: $4,980 Dates: June 17 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Director (Half Time) 2 Teachers 1 Counselor 2 Educational Assistants 1 Librarian (Half Time) 1 Clerk (Part Time) 1 Custodian (Part Time) No. of children to be served: 40 G69233E-735-5-18154

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
38	Hawaii	Operation CCC (Constructing Curriculum Contracts) Selected teachers from Title I eligible schools will be involved in a workshop to develop instructional packages to be used in individualized instructional programs in the succeeding school year. Two experienced instructors from Sacramento, California will assist the teachers. Amount Approved: $9,501 Dates: July 27 - August 14, 1970 Personnel: 1 Instructor-Director 1 Instructor 20 Teachers No. of children to be served: G69233E-735-5-18051
39	Hawaii Hookena	OPERATION LAMB (Language Arts and Math Program) This project is designed to provide selected educationally deprived children with prescribed instructional assistance to help them overcome their deficiencies in language, arts and mathematics. Amount approved: $2,232 Dates: June 1 - July 10, 1970 Personnel: Teacher/Coordinator (1) 1 Teacher 1 Student Helper No. of children to be served: 30 G69233E-735-5-18052

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
40	Hawaii	OPERATION TUTOR (Youth Tutoring Youth) This project is designed to train selected students from eligible Title I schools to assist their peers in certain areas of learning. Teachers who will participate in this workshop will acquire skills in diagnosing and prescribing materials for the students needing special tutoring help. The teachers and the student tutors will learn to work as teams in assisting the educationally deprived students. Amount Approved: $7,212 Dates: Aug. 17-28, 1970 Personnel: 1 Instructor 7 Teachers No. of children to be served: 35 G69233E-735-5-18050
41	Hawaii Hilo Inter.	OPERATION TEAM (Teaching Eager Amateurs Music) To provide selected incoming seventh graders with an opportunity to play a musical instrument, participate in a play, and to plan and build stage settings. These planned activities will help the participants to improve their proficiency in the use and command of language skills as well as to build a positive attitude toward school. Amount approved: $3,548 Dates: June 15 - July 24, 1970 Personnel: 1 Coordinator-Teacher 1 Drama Teacher 1 Student Helper No. of children to be served: 40 G69233E-735-5-18153

STATE PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
42	Honolulu	SUMMER TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR COUNSELORS AND TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED

A teacher training institute will be conducted through the cooperative efforts of Honolulu District and the University of Hawaii, College of Education. Teachers, counselors, educational assistants, parents from the eligible Title I schools will participate in the training. Three classes of twenty children each will provide the laboratory experience for the participants.

Amount Approved: $52,890

Dates: June 17 to July 29, 1970

Personnel: 1 Director
1 Ass't. Director
1 Clerk
36 Teachers
13 Counselors
18 Educational Assistants
18 Parents.

No. of children to be served: 60

G69233E-731-1-18114

SUTHER PROJECT

PROJECT No.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
43	Honolulu Central Int. Dole Int. Kalakaua Int. Hilo Int.	WORK EXPERIENCE CAMP A. A summer camping experience will be provided youngsters aged 13 to 15, who will be given work experiences and earn monetary rewards. B. A six-week camp experience for sixty teen-aged boys will be held at Waimea School on Kauai. These boys will be provided with out-door work experiences and earn monetary rewards. Intense personalized counseling services will be provided. The goal of these two components is to help the participating students to develop better self-images and self-understanding.

Amount Approved: $57,752

Dates: A. June 17 - August 7, 1970
B. June 22 - July 31, 1970

Personnel:

A. 1 Camp Director
4 Camp Councelors

B. 1 Camp Director
1 Principal
4 Camp Counselors
1 Cook
1 Assistant Cook

No. of children to be served:

A. 72
B. 60

G69233E-731-1-18116

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
44	Honolulu	COMPENSATORY SUMMER ACTIVITIES
	All Title I Eligible Schools in District	Children selected from the Title I eligible schools in the district will participate in a special summer program stressing language arts and non-academic activities such as arts and crafts, music, drama and physical education. A camping component is included to provide the participating children with outdoor educational experiences.

Amount Approved: $131,935

Dates: June 17 to July 29, 1970

Personnel:
- 81 Teachers
- 20 Center Directors
- 3 Counselors
- 1 Summer Director
- 1 Evaluator
- 2 Research Assistants
- 3. Psychological Workers
- 8 Educational Assistants
- 20 Clerks
- 20 Custodians

No. of Children to be Served: 1,540

G69233E-731-1-18115

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
45	Kauai Kapaa High Kapaa Elem. Waimea Elem.	SUMMER CAMP PROJECT FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED Twelve selected boys from the eligible schools will be provided outdoor education and camping opportunities. They will learn outdoor living skills and will be provided with intense counseling services to help them adjust to the regular school program. Amount approved: $1,000 Dates: June 13 - 27, 1970 Personnel: Contract with YMCA No. of children served: 12 G-69-233-E-737-7-18173
46	Honolulu Farrington Kaimuki McKinley	FOOD SERVICE AND HOSPITALITY EDUCATION PROJECT To provide selected deprived students among eligible high school students with an opportunity to learn the skills of food service and related services. This would provide the participants with saleable occupational skills upon leaving the school setting. Amount Approved: $3,027.50 Dates: June 15 - July 24, 1970 Personnel: Contract with Kapiolani Community College G-69-233-E-731-1-18117

SUTTER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
47	Central Oahu Aiea High	OPERATION RESCUE Provide students who have failed in English and Social Studies with planned individual instruction to assist them in acquiring practical knowledge of the subject areas. Monetary inducements will be made to encourage better academic performance. Amount approved: $2,738 Dates: June 17 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 2 Secondary Teachers No of children to be served: 30 G-69233E-732-2-18122
48	Central Oahu Wailua High & Inter. Aiea Inter.	DECREASING SCHOOL ALIENATION-ENHANCING BETTER LIVING To provide selected intermediate school students who have been identified as educationally deprived with intensive individual and group counseling in camping sessions. These experiences are to assist the participants in developing better self images which will improve their academic work. Amount approved: $31,220 Dates: June 15, July 29, 1970 Personnel: 2 Camp Directors (Half Time) 7 Counselors (Half Time) 6 Sr. Counselors 1 Evaluation Consultant (Part Time) No. of children to be served: 126 G69233E-732-2-18123

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
49	Leeward Oahu Waianae Elem.	SUMMER ARTS AND CRAFTS PROGRAM Students who have been identified as educationally deprived will be enrolled in one of following components besides being provided with outdoor education experiences: a. Sewing class for girls. b. Class for study of rockets for boys. c. Ceramics class d. Rhythm class Amount approved: $10,774.65 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Project Director 5 Teachers 10 Educational Assistants 1 Clerk 1 Custodian No. of children to be served: 140 G-69233E-733-3-18138
50	Leeward Oahu Waianae Inter.	REMEDIAL READING AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT To provide selected educationally deprived children with individualized instruction in reading and communications skills. Enriching experiences have been included to complement the academic program. Amount approved: $4,500 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Project Director 3 Teachers 1 Educational Assistant 1 Clerk (Part Time) 1 Custodian (Part Time) No. of children to be served: 50 G-69233E-733-3-18136

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
51	Leeward Oahu Nanakulu High	NANAKULI REMEDIAL AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM To provide selected educationally deprived children with experiences in the following areas: (1) reading, (2) social studies, (3) physical education and recreation, and (4) music and practical arts. Cultural enrichment activities will be included in conjunction with the academic program. Amount approved: $5,218 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Director (Part Time) 5 Teachers 1 Secretary (Part Time) 1 Custodian (Part time) No. of children to be served: 60 G-69233E-733-3-18134
52	Leeward Oahu Waianae High	ART AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM To provide selected educationally deprived students with experiences in arts and crafts and physical education and recreation. Amount approved: $4,222.44 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Teacher 1 Project Director 1 Student Aide No. of children to be served: 40 G-69233E-733-3-18135

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
53	Maui Wailuku	SUMMER PRE-SCHOOL To provide selected children from deprived families with experiences in an organized school setting. Amount Approved: $5,951 Dates: June 15- July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Project Director 2 Teachers 2 Educational Assistants 1 Typist (Part Time) 1 Custodian (Part Time) No. of children to be served: 30 G 69233E-736-6-18167
54	Maui Kamehameha III	SUMMER PRE-SCHOOL To provide selected pre-school deprived children with planned activities in a school setting. Amount approved: $2,081 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Teacher 1 Educational Assistant 1 Clerk (Part Time) 1 Custodian (Part Time) No. of children to be served: 15 G-69233E-736-6-18166

SUMMER PROJECTS

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
55	Maui Paiku	SUMMER PRE-SCHOOL A planned program of activities to be provided a group of pre-school aged children who have been identified as deprived. They will be provided with group as well as individual activities. Amount Approved: $2,592 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Teacher 1 Educational Assistant 1 Clerk (Part Time) 1 Custodian (Part Time) No. of children to be served: 15 G-69233-E-736-6-18165
56	Hawaii Hilo High Hilo Inter. Kapiolani	LANAKILA COMMUNITY STUDY CENTER To provide selected children with opportunities to extend through the summer months activities in reading and individual study. Amount approved: $706 Dates: July 1 - August 31, 1970 Personnel: 1 Library Aide No. of children to be served: 275 G-69233E-735-5-18156

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
57	Windward Oahu Waiahole Kahaluu Hauula Laie Kaaawa	WINDWARD DISTRICT SUMMER ART PROJECT To provide selected students who have been identified as being educationally deprived with opportunities to participate in an intensive program emphasizing Hawaiian arts, crafts and culture. This experience will enhance their self-image and assist the students to improve their academic work. Amount approved: $17,550 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Project Director 8 Teachers No. of children to be served: 220 G-69233E-734-4-18146
58	Windward Oahu Waimanalo Pope	POPE-WAIMANALO SUMMER ART ENRICHMENT PROJECT To provide selected students who have been identified as educationally deprived with opportunities to participate in an intensive in-depth summer art enrichment program with an emphasis on Hawaiian arts, crafts and culture. These children will be provided opportunities to achieve success which will enhance their regular academic work. Amount approved: $11,454 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Project Director 3 Teachers No. of children to be served: 100 G-69233E-734-4-18145

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
59	Leeward Oahu	COORDINATION OF TITLE I PROJECTS To provide coordination and administration in support of the Title I projects in the Leeward Oahu District. The evaluator/writer will assist the District Coordinator in providing these services. Amount Approved: $750.00 Dates: June 22 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Evaluator/writer No. of children to be served: G-69233E-733-3-18030
60	Leeward Oahu Makaha Maili	MAKAHA-MAILI LANGUAGE SKILLS PROJECT To provide selected children identified as being educationally deprived with opportunities to participate in planned individualized educational activities. The activities include reading, speaking, listening, creative writing and creative art. Enrichment activities will be planned to supplement the academic activities. Amount approved: $40,557 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Project Director 24 Teachers 1 Librarian 1 Clerk (Part Time) 1 Custodian (Part Time) No. of children to be served: 471 G-69233E-733-3-18137

SUMMER PROJECT

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
61	Leeward Oahu Nanaikapono	NANAIKAPONO SUMMER LANGUAGE PROGRAM To provide a group of the most seriously educationally deprived students with opportunities to participate in remedial and enrichment activities to strengthen their communication and language skills. Amount approved: $5,025 Dates: June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Project Director 6 Teachers 3 Educational Assistants 1 Clerk 1 Custodian No. of children to be served: 198 G-69233E-733-3-18031
62	Maui Wailuku	LANGUAGE ARTS AND ARITHMETIC PROGRAM To provide a group of educationally deprived students an opportunity to participate in academic learning activities that will assist them in retaining the knowledge gained during the regular school year. Amount approved; $2,539 Dates: June 15- July 29, 1970 Personnel: 2 Teachers 1 Clerk (Part-time) 1 Custodian (Part-Time) No. of children to be served: 30 G-69233E-736-6-18061

SUMMER PROJECTS

PROJECT NO.	DISTRICT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
63	Maui	SUMMER SCHOOL
	Maui High	To provide a group of selected educationally deprived students with an opportunity to participate in individualized educational activities designed to improve their reading and writing skills. Amount approved $7,059 Dates; June 15 - July 29, 1970 Personnel: 1 Project Director 5 Teachers 1 Clerk No. of children to be served: 50 G-69233E-736-6-18168

APPENDIX C

Evaluative Analysis of Data

by

Education Research and Development Center
University of Hawaii

EVALUATIVE ANALYSES OF DATA

PROVIDED BY 1969-70 TITLE I (P.L. 89-10) PROJECTS

ADMINISTERED BY THE HAWAII STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

A Final Report to the
Hawaii State Department of Education
on Services Provided Under Contract with the
Education Research and Development Center (University of Hawaii)

Education Research and Development Center
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

August 1970

EVALUATIVE ANALYSES OF DATA

PROVIDED BY 1969-70 TITLE I (P.L. 89-10) PROJECTS

ADMINISTERED BY THE HAWAII STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Participating EDRAD Staff:

Frederick T. Bail, Ph.D., Assistant Researcher (Supervisor)
Donald A. Leton, Ph.D., Researcher
Kendel S. Tang, Ph.D., Assistant Researcher
Patricia Leong, M.Ed., Assistant in Research
Eileen Zukemura, M.A., Assistant in Research
Robert Bloedon, M.A., Assistant in Research
Caroline Murata, Student Help
Joanne Otsuka, Student Help
Sharon Sato, Student Help
Merlene Kamiya, Student Help
Jane Ito, Stenographer
Alice Inada, Stenographer

A Final Report to the
Hawaii State Department of Education
on Services Provided Under Contract with the
Education Research and Development Center (University of Hawaii)

David G. Ryans, Director
Education Research and Development Center
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

August 1970

FOREWORD

The carrying out of EDRAD's responsibilities in the evaluation of the 1969-70 Title I Program conducted by the Hawaii State Department of Education was under the supervision of Dr. Frederick T. Bail. This report was written by Dr. Kendel S. Tang. The processing and analyses of the data were performed by Miss Patricia Leong using computer programs written by Miss Eileen Zukemura and Mr. Robert Bloedon.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	i
I. Introduction	1
II. Comparison of Title I 1968-69 and 1969-70 Posttest Data	8
III. Analyses of Pretest and Posttest Data	12
A. Statewide Summary of Results by Grade Level	12
1. Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Grades Pre, K, 1)	12
2. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Grades 2-12)	14
3. Stanford Achievement Test (Arithmetic Computation) (Grades 2-12)	18
4. School Attitude Inventory (Grades 4-12)	19
B. Comparison of Results of Individual Projects	20
1. Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Grades Pre, K, and 1)	21
2. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Grades 2-12)	24
3. Stanford Achievement Test (Grades 2-12)	28
4. School Attitude Inventory (Grades 4-12)	29
5. Outstanding Title I Projects	31
IV. Discussion	34
V. Summary and Recommendations	38
References	40

I. Introduction

Contract between the Hawaii State Department of Education (DOE) and the Education Research and Development Center (EDRAD), University of Hawaii completed on October 7, 1969, provided that specified services be performed by EDRAD as part of a statewide evaluation of DOE's educational services relative to Public Law 89-10, Title I Program.

A. Contract Specifications

The contract between DOE and EDRAD specified that the following services be performed by EDRAD for the Hawaii State Department of Education:

1. to compile a list of appropriate standardized tests by major areas and grade levels in light of program objectives and make recommendations to DOE as to the most valid and reliable tests for measuring the stated project objectives (verbal and numerical);

2. to assist DOE in the administration of the school alienation inventory (School Attitude Inventory) for students enrolled in Compensatory Education:

   (a) print and score the pretest and posttest of the school attitude inventory;

   (b) summarize findings for school utilization, and

   (c) discuss results with the Administrator of Compensatory Education;

3. to assist DOE in writing instructions for administration of instruments, including time schedules, etc.;

4. provide statistical analyses of pretest and posttest raw scores;

5. to provide schools and DOE with a report of the results and analyses of differences between pretest and posttest data at the conclusion of the project;

6. to assist DOE by participating in discussions of the evaluation report with district coordinators;

7. to assemble and interpret the statewide data provided by individual projects involved in the pretesting and posttesting, relative to project objectives, to permit an overall evaluation of pupil achievement; to compile a statewide summary of the evaluation data relating to program objectives for inclusion in the annual Department of Education's Title I report for Fiscal Year 1970.

B. Title I Program Objectives

Title I projects included in the evaluation were those whose major purposes were to achieve one or more of the following objectives:

1. to improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests (language arts);

2. to improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations;

3. to improve verbal functioning;

4. to improve performance as measured by standardized tests (arithmetic and quantitative skills); and

5. to improve attitude toward school which may result in reduced dropout rate.

C. Review of EDRAD-DOE 1969-70 Evaluation Efforts

As a preliminary to formal contractual agreement entered into by DOE and EDRAD, an outline of events and services to be shared by DOE

and EDRAD in the 1969-70 evaluation of Title I Program was prepared by EDRAD and agreed upon by DOE. The outline specified the extent of EDRAD and DOE responsibilities in carrying out evaluative procedures relative to Title I Program and the tentative dates on which certain evaluative activities were to be performed.

According to the outline, EDRAD assumed responsibility for the following:

1. make recommendations to DOE concerning the most valid and reliable measures for evaluating statewide Title I Program objectives;

2. provide DOE with School Attitude Inventory (SAI) forms;

3. score and analyze SAI responses;

4. analyze pretest and posttest scores of Title I students on recommended standardized tests; and

5. prepare summary of results for inclusion in the DOE Title I report for fiscal year 1970.

DOE assumed responsibility for the following:

1. order standardized tests;

2. survey project objectives and population sizes from field projects; and

3. administer pretests and posttests.

1. Recommendations. In the hope that the 1969-70 evaluation would be more effective than the previous ones, EDRAD made the following recommendations in the 1968-69 final report (EDRAD, 1969, p. 44):

a. "that pretests be administered in late September rather than in late November (as was the case this year, 1968-69);

b. "that a test of arithmetic and quantitative skills also be administered in order to determine the extent to which objective No. 4 of Title I projects is being achieved. For this purpose, it is recommended

that the Arithmetic Computation subtest of the Stanford Achievement Te[illegible] be used. In the interest of economy, it is further suggested that only one form of the test be used, the same form being employed for both pretest and posttest, since it is quite unlikely that familiarization effect will significantly operate over seven to eight months with purely numerical computations. Test security will, of course, be important.

"The tests designated for the appropriate grade levels for Title I students are listed below:

Stanford Achievement Test, Primary I - Grades 2-3

Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II - Grades 4-5

Stanford Achievement Test, Intermediate I - Grades 6-7

Stanford Achievement Test, Intermediate II - Grades 8-9

Stanford Achievement Test, Advanced - Grades 10-12

3. "that the School Attitude Inventory be included in the testing program in order to estimate the extent to which Objective No. 5 of Title I projects is being achieved. Only the Upper Grade Form of this instrument will be administered, and only grades 4-12 included;

4. "that if the Department of Education wants EDRAD to perform an extra service of also describing the most successful projects, it should provide (the latter) information relative to significant features on each project, by grade level."

2. Implementation. The first recommendation in last year's report was not carried out. Although DOE was to have ordered the recommended standardized tests on August 20, 1969, for administration in late September, pretesting of standardized tests was not carried out until late January, 1970. Pretesting for only the SAI was done in early November, 1969. EDRAD furnished DOE with the SAI forms in September, 1969, as scheduled. The instrument could not be administered in September since

DOE had not yet made the survey of objectives and population sizes of Title I field projects. This survey was actually done in early October, 1969. It was scheduled to have been completed by August 25, 1969.

The second, third, and fourth recommendations were implemented in 1969-70. DOE furnished EDRAD with a list of Title I project activities and/or services as suggested in the fourth recommendation and EDRAD identified and described the most successful projects in terms of their activities and/or services.

Incoming data from various participating schools were carefully checked by EDRAD against data furnished by DOE on the latter's survey of project objectives and population sizes. Title I projects which had Objectives 1, 2 and 3 were administered the Metropolitan Readiness Tests in grades preschool through one and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests in grades two through twelve. Projects which claimed Objective 4 were administered the Arithmetic Computation subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test. It should be noted that these standardized tests were recommended to be administered at the grade levels approximately two grades above the grade norms of the tests. In other words, tests designed for average fourth graders were administered to sixth grade Title I students. Projects which had Objective 5 were given the SAI in grades four through twelve as earlier recommended.

3. Irregularities in test administrations. Some schools submitted test data which were not appropriate for their stated objectives. Other schools delivered posttest data only (no pretest) or pretest data only (no posttest) for certain individuals.

Posttest measures were administered as scheduled except for the School Attitude Inventory. The SAI was administered in March, 1970, to about half of the Title I students who were supposed to take it and

again in April, 1970, to the remaining half. The SAI was originally scheduled to be administered in March, 1970, but due to about two months' delay in its initial administration, EDRAD suggested in early February that the SAI be administered in April instead of March, in order to lengthen the testing interval between pretest and posttest to five months. Some schools, however, administered the SAI in March and others administered it in April, 1970. SAI data were therefore analyzed separately by testing interval (four or five months) and combined and analyzed together by grade level in the statewide evaluation.

D. Description of Evaluative Procedures

The original design for the Title I evaluation was basically a pretest-posttest analysis of mean differences, i.e., average gains or losses. The evaluation instruments were to be administered to Title I students early in the school year and again after an interval of seven to eight months, i.e., toward the end of the school year. It was assumed that gains made by students participating in Title I projects could be attributed mainly to activities and services rendered by Title I projects.

For ethical reasons, evaluation of the Title I Program could not be conducted with true experimental controls, i.e., exclusion of some eligible Title I students from the program for the purpose of obtaining a true control group could not be ethically justified. In a sense, however, each Title I pupil served as his own control, since pre- and posttest measures were taken on the same individuals. Furthermore, the different projects themselves served as controls for one another in the comparative evaluation of the various projects. Finally, the norms provided in the manuals of the standardized tests furnished criteria or standards by which to gauge the progress of Title I students relative to national norms.

The irregularities in the test administrations resulted in many schools submitting only posttest data. It was then decided that the 1969-70 posttest means be compared with the 1968-69 posttest means so that use could be made of the information contained in these incomplete data. This was done by comparing the performances of the 1969-70 Title I students with the performances of their counterparts in the preceding school year, assuming that the 1969-70 Title I students were not Title I participants in 1968-69. If the 1969-70 Title I students were the same as the 1968-69 Title I participants, then the 1968-69 and 1969-70 posttest-posttest comparisons would reveal either progress or lack of progress in the course of a school year.

Comparisons of 1968-69 and 1969-70 pretest data were not made for two reasons: (1) many pretest means were missing in the 1969-70 data and (2) different pretest administration dates for 1968-69 (November) and 1969-70 (January) made comparisons of these data inappropriate.

E. Summary of Analyses Performed

To determine the significance of the observed differences (gains or losses) between pretest and posttest scores, a *t*-test was performed on the correlated sets of data. This analysis was performed on available test data by school, by grade within school, and statewide by grade. A *z*-test for uncorrelated data was used in comparing 1968-69 and 1969-70 posttest means.

Finally, to check whether the regression effect was contributing significantly to the statewide results, the data were subjected to a regression analysis. However, since the analysis of regression is a statistical technique to determine the significance of the correlation between predictor (pretest) and criterion (posttest), i.e., the degree of predictability of posttest scores from pretest scores, a significant

F-ratio obtained from this analysis indicates substantial correlation between pretest and posttest scores. It does not, however, indicate whether the correlation is merely a statistical artifact due to the regression phenomenon, a result of the experimental treatment, or some combination of both. The regression effect therefore may be confounded with the treatment effect. In order to make the findings more conclusive, the results were corrected for regression effect where significant F-ratios were obtained in the analysis of regression to determine whether the residuals were significant. It was assumed that the residuals (differences between actual and predicted scores) were due to treatment. More confidence was placed in the gains which remained significant after correction for the regression effect than in those gains which were not significant after the effects of regression was accounted for.

F. Dissemination

In the dissemination of information relative to Title I evaluation, EDRAD participated in two DOE-initiated conferences with school administrators, project coordinators, and interested teachers. The first conference was held in Honolulu on August 20, 1969, and the second in Wahiawa on May 26, 1970.

Results of analyses of 1969-70 Title I data with the accompanying explanation were sent to each participating school via DOE at the end of the 1969-70 school year. A summary of the results with their interpretations was also submitted to DOE.

II. Comparison of Title I 1968-69 and 1969-70

Posttest Data

Posttest mean scores by grade level of 1969-70 Title I students on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests were compared with the corresponding mean scores of 1968-69 Title I students on the same tests to determine indirectly the progress made by 1969-70 Title I students. This was done since, as mentioned in the introduction, many of the 1969-70 Title I participating schools submitted only students' posttest scores.

Comparisons of the 1968-69 and 1969-70 posttest means were performed using a z-test. Table I shows the means, standard deviations and number of cases for both the 1968-69 and 1969-70 groups on the various subtests of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests. The last column of Table 1 shows the z-ratio obtained from the comparison of corresponding means on each subtest. A negative z-ratio indicates that the 1969-70 posttest mean was higher than the corresponding 1968-69 posttest mean on a certain subtest since the mean difference was obtained by subtracting the former from the latter. Significance of the difference between the means compared is indicated by the presence of one ($p \leq .05$) or two ($p \leq .01$) asterisks after the corresponding z-ratio.

Examination of the results showed that there were no significant differences between 1968-69 and 1969-70 posttest means on the word meaning, listening, matching, and numbers subtests of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests at the kindergarten level. This indicates that the

1969-70 Title I kindergarten pupils performed just as well as their 1968-69 counterparts (performance of 1968-69 Title I students improved significantly from pretest to posttest in all subtests except listening). (See Table 2 of 1968-69 EDRAD's Final Report to DOE on Title I Evaluation.) The 1969-70 Title I kindergarten pupils had a significantly higher posttest mean score on the alphabet subtest but a significantly lower posttest mean score on the copying subtest than their 1968-69 counterparts. However, compared to their own initial performance on the copying subtest, the 1969-70 kindergarten pupils improved significantly over the school year (see Table 2). The mean scores of the two groups on the total Metropolitan Readiness Tests were not significantly different.

At the first grade level, no statistically significant differences were observed between the 1968-69 and 1969-70 means on any of the subtests with the exception of the word meaning subtest. The 1968-69 first grade Title I pupils had a significantly higher mean on this subtest than the 1969-70 pupils. However, compared to their own initial performance on the word meaning subtest, the 1969-70 first grade Title I pupils made a significant ($p \leq .01$) mean gain (see Table 2). The nonsignificant difference between the means of the two groups on the total test indicates that both performed at about the same level on the posttest.

On the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests there were no significant differences between the means of 1968-69 and 1969-70 second and third graders on the vocabulary and comprehension subtests. Examination of their respective scores, however, revealed that both groups made

significant gains from pre- to posttest on all the subtests (see Table 3 of this report and Tables 4 and 5 of EDRAD's 1968-69 Final Report).

Significant differences favoring the 1968-69 students were observed between the means of 1968-69 and 1969-70 fourth and fifth graders on both the vocabulary and comprehension subtests of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests. This does not mean, however, that the 1969-70 fourth and fifth graders did not achieve significant gains relative to their initial performance. Even though their final performance was significantly lower than that of their 1968-69 counterparts, those 1969-70 students who had pretest scores also made significant progress, on the average (see Table 4).

Posttest mean scores of the 1969-70 sixth graders were not significantly different from the corresponding 1968-69 means on the vocabulary subtest, but were significantly lower on the comprehension subtest. However, the 1969-70 group of sixth graders made significant gains from pre- to posttest on both subtests (see Table 4).

At the seventh grade level the 1969-70 posttest mean on the speed subtest of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests was significantly higher than the corresponding 1968-69 mean. There were no statistically significant differences found between 1968-69 and 1969-70 posttest means on the accuracy, vocabulary, or comprehension subtests. Performance of the two groups was therefore comparable on these last three subtests.

Though no significant differences between the 1968-69 and 1969-70 posttest means were found at the ninth and tenth grade levels, the 1969-70 ninth grade posttest means on all the four subtests (speed, accuracy, vocabulary and comprehension) were somewhat higher

than the corresponding 1968-69 posttest means. The difference on the vocabulary subtest approached statistical significance.

The differences between the 1968-69 and 1969-70 posttest means of tenth graders were significant only on the speed and accuracy subtests (in favor of the 1969-70 group). The mean differences on the vocabulary and comprehension subtests were not statistically significant, indicating comparable final performance.

At the eleventh and twelfth grade level, there were no significant mean differences between the 1968-69 and 1969-70 groups on any of the four subtests of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests. This finding indicates comparable posttest performance by both groups.

In general, the 1969-70 Title I students performed as well as their 1968-69 counterparts. Whereas fourth, fifth and sixth grade 1969-70 Title I means were somewhat lower than the corresponding 1968-69 means 1969-70 Title I students had generally higher means at the ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade levels (see Table 1).

Though these comparisons assume that the 1968-69 and 1969-70 Title I populations were comprised of different students, some students in the 1968-69 group may have been retained in the 1969-70 Title I Program. Retention of some students in the Title I Program for more than one year, however, does not necessarily suggest a different interpretation of the above results, especially if the same students took tests of different difficulty levels. More direct measures of the effectiveness of the Title I Program are the gains made by the students in any given school year from pretest to posttest; these are discussed in the next section.

III. Analyses of Pretest and Posttest Data

A. Statewide Summary of Results by Grade Level

At the outset it should be mentioned that "statewide results" refer only to results for schools which had both pre- and posttest data available. Due to the late ordering of the tests, the unavailability of some tests at the time they were needed, and some problems in the administration of the tests, not all Title I schools were able to submit both pre- and posttest data for inclusion in the statewide analyses. Consequently, several of the statewide analyses by grade level were based on data from only a few schools and occasionally on the data of just one school. Thus, in judging the overall effectiveness of the Title I Program, other evaluative criteria should be used in addition to these "statewide results."

1. Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Grades Pre, K, 1)

At the preschool level, significant results were obtained on four of the six subtests of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests. The four subtests are word meaning, matching, numbers, and copying. On the total test, a significant ($p \leq .01$) mean gain (i.e., mean difference) of 6.42 was obtained from the pretest administered in January, 1970, to the posttest administered in May, 1970 (see Table 2). However, these results were based on data submitted by only two schools (viz., Waiahole El. and High School and Hanalei School), encompassing only 26 pupils.

Relative to the national norms, the preschool Title I pupils progressed from the 12th percentile to the 19th percentile. It should be noted, however, that the standardization group for the Metropolitan Readiness Tests consisted of children who were either finishing kindergarten or entering grade one. Furthermore, the "standardization group may be slightly superior to the national average with respect to median income and average schooling of adults in the communities" (Hildreth, Griffiths, & McGauvran, 1965, p. 15).

At the kindergarten level, the statewide analyses were based on data for 230 pupils from 22 schools. Significant gains were obtained on five of the six subtests (word meaning, matching, alphabet, numbers, and copying) of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests. The overall mean gain (mean difference) from pretest (January, 1970) to posttest (May, 1970) of 10.09 was significant beyond the $p = .01$ level of confidence (see Table 2). The progress from pretest to posttest was equivalent to an improvement from the 20th percentile to the 36th percentile, as measured against national norms. On the average, children scoring on the 36th percentile are "likely to succeed in first grade work" (Metropolitan Readiness Test Manual, 1965, p. 8). However, the Manual suggests that careful study should be made of specific strengths and weaknesses of individual pupils and their instruction planned accordingly.

At the first grade level, results of the analyses based on 522 cases from 35 schools revealed significant gains on all six subtests of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests, viz., word meaning, listening, matching,

alphabet, numbers, and copying. The total gain score of 8.52 was also significant ($p \leq .01$) (see Table 2). Using national norms, the total pretest and posttest mean scores were equivalent to the 56th and 65th percentiles, respectively. (The mean scores are reported here in percentile equivalents since the Metropolitan Readiness Test Manual does not have grade score equivalents for raw scores.)

2. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Grades 2-12)

At the second grade level, results of analyses based on data provided by 163 pupils from 18 schools showed significant gains ($p \leq .01$) on both the vocabulary and comprehension subtests of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (see Table 3). For all analyses of the Gates-MacGinitie by grade level, the testing interval from pretest to posttest was approximately four months. Though these gains were statistically significant, by national standards, the Title I pupils included in these analyses progressed only from a pretest mean grade equivalent score of 1.4 (four months in the first grade) to the posttest mean grade equivalent of 1.6 (six months in the first grade) on the vocabulary subtest and from 1.5 to 1.6 grade equivalent scores on the comprehension subtest. (It should be noted that comparison of Title I educationally and culturally deprived children in Hawaii with the average children of the same grade level on the U.S. Mainland in terms of academic progress may be inappropriate.)

The results of analyses of third grade data on 128 cases from 17 schools showed significant gains on both the vocabulary and comprehension subtests of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (hereafter referred to as G-MacGRT). The results were significant beyond the $p \leq .01$ level (see Table 3).

At the fourth grade level, there were 96 cases from 12 schools. Results of analyses of the data on these 96 pupils showed significant gains ($p \leq .01$) made from pre- to posttest on both the vocabulary and comprehension subtests of the G-MacGRT (see Table 4). Compared to the national norms these 96 pupils obtained grade scores of 2.8 and 3.0 for the pretest and posttest, respectively, on the vocabulary subtest and grade score equivalents of 2.6 for the pretest and 2.8 for the posttest on the comprehension subtest.

At the fifth grade level, significant results were also obtained on both the vocabulary and listening subtests of the G-MacGRT. The analyses were based on data from 91 pupils from 11 schools. Significant mean gain scores on both the vocabulary subtest ($p \leq .01$) and the comprehension subtest ($p \leq .05$) were found (see Table 4). The pretest and posttest mean scores were equivalent to grade scores of 3.3 and 3.4, respectively, on the vocabulary subtest and 2.9 and 3.0, respectively, on the comprehension subtest; this implies progress of only .1 grade compared to the national norms.

At the sixth grade level, using data on 94 pupils from 12 schools, mean gain scores on both the vocabulary and comprehension subtests were significant ($p \leq .01$) (see Table 4). Mean grade score progress on the vocabulary subtest was from 3.9 to 4.2 while that on the comprehension subtest was from 3.5 to 3.9.

At the seventh grade level, significant improvement was observed on the speed, accuracy, and comprehension subtests of the G-MacGRT, while students' performance on the vocabulary subtest remained

practically the same from pre- to posttest (see Table 5). These analyses were based on data from 150 cases in ten schools.

Compared to the national norms, the students' mean grade equivalent score progressed from 4.8 to 5.8 on the speed subtest, 4.4 to 4.9 on the accuracy subtest, and 3.6 to 4.1 on the comprehension subtest. On the vocabulary subtest, the pretest and posttest scores were equivalent to the grade scores of 4.4 and 4.2, respectively.

Analyses of the eighth grade statewide data were based on only 53 cases coming from seven schools. Mean differences between pretest and posttest mean scores were significant on three of the four subtests of the G-MacGRT, viz., speed, accuracy, and comprehension (see Table 5). No significant change was observed on the vocabulary subtest. Relative to the national grade norms, the students progressed from 4.8 to 7.0 on the speed subtest, 3.8 to 4.6 on the accuracy subtest, and 3.2 to 3.3 on the comprehension subtest, over the course of four months. Pretest and posttest mean scores on the vocabulary subtest were each equivalent to a grade score of 3.9.

At the ninth grade level, significant progress was observed only on the speed and accuracy subtest of the G-MacGRT. Pretest and posttest mean scores were 20.4 and 24.74 on the speed subtest, 17.17 and 21.23 on the vocabulary subtest, and 33.54 and 33.70 on the comprehension subtest (see Table 6). The analyses were based on data from 106 pupils in four schools. In terms of mean grade score equivalents, pre- and posttest mean scores were 6.3 and 8.1 on the speed subtest and 5.5 and 7.5 on the accuracy subtest. On the vocabulary and comprehension subtests, the grade scores remained at 5.0 and 4.8, respectively.

At the tenth grade level, significant improvement in performance was observed on the speed and accuracy subtests ($p \leq .01$). Pre- and posttest mean differences on both the vocabulary and comprehension subtests were not statistically significant (see Table 6). These analyses treated scores from only 58 pupils in two schools (Waialua High and Intermediate School and Konawaena High and Intermediate School). Grade score equivalents for pretest and posttest mean scores were 10.7 and 12.3 on the speed subtest, 8.0 and 9.8 on the accuracy subtest, 5.6 and 5.9 on the vocabulary subtest, and 4.5 and 4.3 on the comprehension subtest.

Analyses of eleventh grade statewide data were based on only 34 cases from three schools (Waianae High, Hilo High, and Konawaena High). Significant differences were not noted between pretest and posttest mean scores on any of the four subtests (see Table 6). Grade score equivalents for both pre- and posttest mean scores were 10.7 on the speed subtest, 8.6 on the accuracy subtest, and 6.6 on the vocabulary subtest. Mean grade scores on the comprehension subtest were 6.0 for the pretest and 5.8 for the posttest.

The twelfth grade data were furnished by only one school (Hilo High) with just 10 cases. Obviously, this school could not be regarded as representative of statewide Title I participating schools at this grade level. But since these were the only data available, they were analyzed under the statewide category. Significant improvement ($p \leq .05$) was observed only on the speed subtest (see Table 6). Mean differences on the three other subtests were not significant. Grade score equivalents for pretest and posttest mean scores were 8.5 and 12.3 on the vocabulary

subtest, 8.0 and 9.2 on the accuracy subtest, 7.7 and 7.7 on the vocabulary subtest, and 6.6 and 6.6 on the comprehension subtest.

3. Stanford Achievement Test (Arithmetic Computation) (Grades 2-12)

Analyses using the Stanford Achievement Test (arithmetic computation) were based on few cases for each grade and thus were probably not representative of the numerical performance of Title I students statewide. Although these data have been analyzed statewide, generalization to the statewide population should probably not be made.

For grade two, pretest and posttest mean scores were 30.5 and 31.39, respectively. This gain of 0.89 was not statistically significant. The analysis was based on only 27 cases from two schools (Hauula and Keaukaha El.). In terms of equivalent grade scores, both pretest and posttest mean scores were equivalent to 1.6.

For grade three, the mean difference was not significant. The number of cases was extremely small (four), coming from just one school, Keaukaha Elementary. The grade equivalent score for both pretest and posttest means was 1.8.

For the fourth grade level, a significant mean increase ($p \leq .01$) was found. Equivalent grade scores for pretest and posttest means were 3.0 and 3.6, respectively, a progress of .6 grade in four months according to national norms. There were, however, only 23 cases from two schools (Hauula and Keaukaha Elementary).

At the fifth grade level, the obtained mean increase of 2.38 (from 21 pupils in Hauula El. and Keaukaha Elementary) was not statistically significant. Equivalent grade scores for pretest and posttest means were 3.3 and 3.6, respectively.

Data for the sixth grade did not indicate a statistically significant

mean increase from pretest to posttest. Again, there were only nine pupils, all from Keaukaha Elementary. Pre- and posttest means were equivalent to grade scores of 4.9 and 5.3, respectively.

No data were available for seventh, and twelfth grades on the Arithmetic Computation subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT).

At the eighth grade level, analysis was based on just five cases from Konawaena High and Intermediate School. The obtained mean gain of 1.40 failed to reach statistical significance. By national norms, the pretest and posttest mean scores were equivalent to grade scores of 5.1 and 5.4, respectively.

All the statewide ninth grade data on 72 students also came from Konawaena High and Intermediate School. A statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) gain was obtained from pretest to posttest. Grade score equivalents of pretest and posttest mean scores were 5.9 and 6.1, respectively.

4. School Attitude Inventory (Grades 4-12)

The School Attitude Inventory (SAI) is an instrument constructed by EDRAD to measure general attitude toward school. Its development is described in EDRAD's 1969 Final Report to DOE (EDRAD, 1969). Adoption of the SAI by DOE as a measure of attitude toward school was based on EDRAD's recommendation (EDRAD, 1969, p. 44).

Data for the SAI were analyzed initially in two sets, according to the length of the time interval occurring between the pretest and the posttest. One set of SAI data had a testing interval of approximately five months. After completion of these two analyses, the two sets of data were combined and analyzed as one set.

Results of the analysis of the first set of data (4-month testing interval), by grade level are shown in Table 8. Among the nine grade levels (grades 4-12) significant mean decreases from pretest to posttest were observed for grades seven, nine, and ten. The pretest mean for the seventh grade, for instance, was 129.29 with a standard deviation of 22.84. The posttest mean for the same grade was 125.35 with a standard deviation of 23.82. The difference between the pretest and posttest means of -3.94 was significant ($p \leq .05$) with 140 cases. The mean decreases obtained in the ninth and tenth grades were significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. The results for the rest of the grades were not statistically significant. Mean SAI scores increased for grades 11 and 12, but not significantly so.

Results of the analysis of the second set of data (5-month testing interval) are presented in Table 9. In this analysis, grades nine and ten showed statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) decreases in mean SAI score from pretest to posttest. Most of the other obtained mean differences were gains, but none were statistically significant.

Results of the analysis of combined data from both testing intervals are shown in Table 10. Significant decreases were found in grades seven ($p \leq .05$), nine ($p \leq .01$), and ten ($p \leq .01$). The mean differences obtained for the remaining grade levels were not statistically significant.

B. Comparison of Results of Individual Projects

Comparisons of various projects were based on the magnitude of significant mean differences between pretest and posttest mean scores.

These comparisons used both subtest scores and total test scores on each of the tests employed.

1. Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Grades Pre, K, and 1)

At the preschool level, only Waiahole, Hanalei, and Hana participated. (Data from Hana were not included in the statewide analyses since they were received late.) Waiahole had the most successful project in that it made the most significant gains on the word meaning, matching, and number subtests, as well as on the total test. Hanalei made a statistically significant gain only on the copying subtest, while Hana made no gains at all on five of the subtests used. In fact, significant decreases were noted on the word meaning, listening, matching, and copying subtests (see Tables 11-24).

At the kindergarten level, 23 schools submitted pre- and posttest data for analysis. (Data from one school were analyzed late and failed to be included in the statewide analyses.) Schools that achieved significant gains on the particular subtests are listed below according to the magnitude of the significant gains made. (When more than 10 schools made significant gains on a given subtest, only the 10 greatest gains are given.)

Word Meaning

1. Honaunau
2. Maili
3. Koloa

Listening

1. Paauilo
2. Maili
3. Kaahumanu

Matching

1. Honaunau
2. Paauilo
3. Hookena
4. Royal
5. Keaukaha
6. Laupahoehoe
7. Maili

Alphabet	Numbers	Copying	Total
1. Kula	1. Paauilo	1. Maili	1. Paauilo
2. Paauilo	2. Kaahumanu	2. Paauilo	2. Honaunau
3. Koloa	3. Laupahoehoe	3. Koloa	3. Maili
4. Laie	4. Lanakila	4. Honaunau	4. Koloa
5. Laupahoehoe	5. Koloa	5. Royal	5. Laupahoehoe
6. Wahiawa	6. Honaunau	6. Likelike	6. Kauluwela
7. Kauluwela	7. Kapiolani	7. Kauluwela	7. Kaahumanu
8. Keaukaha		8. Wahiawa	8. Wahiawa
9. Likelike		9. Kapiolani	9. Likelike
10. Kaahumanu			10. Royal

It should be noted that the above judgments were made on the basis of the statistical significance of the gains and not on the absolute value of the gains themselves. Sometimes a large mean gain using data from only a few subjects was not as statistically significant as a small mean gain with a large number of subjects. Thus, for example, on the matching subtest Kula made a higher mean gain (4.00) than Hookena (2.88) but the former's gain failed to reach statistical significance since there were only two cases involved (see Table 29). A much greater gain would be required to meet the criterion of statistical significance with a sample of only two. For other such cases, see Tables 25-38.

Most of the gains achieved were significant beyond what could be attributed to statistical regression--i.e., to prediction of posttest score from knowledge of pretest score alone. However, it should be remembered that the regression phenomenon itself is confounded with the treatment effect. A significant F-ratio obtained from an analysis of variance of simple linear regression simply indicates that a usefully valid prediction can be made from the pretest to the posttest. However, a significant F-ratio for the analysis of regression does not necessarily

imply gains or losses. It simply denotes that a high enough correlation, either positive or negative, exists between pretest and posttest scores to warrant a valid prediction of one from the other.

To be relatively assured that the observed gains were greater than what could be expected from the regression phenomenon alone (i.e., regression toward the mean), the following procedure was employed. The mean difference between actual posttest and predicted posttest scores, using pretest scores as the predictor was computed for each subtest in each school and tested against the null hypothesis, i.e., that the regressed mean difference was not significantly different from zero. This was done by dividing the regressed mean difference score for each school by the standard error of regressed scores (differences between actual and predicted scores) for all the subjects for each subtest.

Using the t-test results, mean differences which were significantly larger than those which could be expected from the regression effect alone are marked with a plus sign (+) or signs (++), depending on the level of their significance ($p \leq .05$) and $p \leq .01$, respectively). For example, in Table 25, the mean difference score of 1.53 for Maili has two plus signs after it to indicate that it is significantly larger ($p \leq .01$) than what would be expected from the regression effects alone.

In some cases, such as that of Royal on the matching subtest (see Table 29), the gain of 2.62 was not significantly larger than what would be expected from regression alone. Nevertheless, such results were not discounted since, as mentioned above, regression toward the mean is, in the case of Title I projects, confounded with the treatment

effect. Greater confidence can be placed on the gains if they are significant by both the t-test and the regression test.

To continue, schools which made significant gains on the various subtests and on the total test at the first grade level are listed below.

Word Meaning	Listening	Matching
1. Aiea	1. Wahiawa	1. Honaunau
2. Royal	2. Kahaluu	2. Ben Parker
3. Maili	3. Waialua	3. Kahaluu
4. Holualoa	4. Aiea	4. Wailuku
5. Wailuku	5. Maili	5. Fern
6. Fern	6. Ben Parker	6. Aiea
7. Kalihi-kai	7. Holualoa	7. Waialua
8. Kauluwela		8. Maili
		9. Kaiulani
		10. Kalihi-kai

Alphabet	Numbers	Copying	Total
1. Pahoa	1. Ben Parker	1. Paauilo	1. Ben Parker
2. Wailuku	2. Honaunau	2. Ben Parker	2. Maili
3. Ben Parker	3. Maili	3. Honaunau	3. Honaunau
4. Haleiwa	4. Nanakuli	4. Koloa	4. Aiea
5. Anuenue	5. Kalihi-waena	5. Kalihi-waena	5. Wailuku
6. Honaunau	6. Kaewai	6. Maili	6. Haleiwa
7. Laupahoehoe	7. Aiea	7. Haleiwa	7. Pahoa
8. Maili	8. Wailuku	8. Kalihi-kai	8. Kahaluu
9. Waialua	9. Haleiwa	9. Kaiulani	9. Fern
10. Kaiulani	10. Waialua	10. Aiea	10. Wahiawa

There were a total of 36 schools which participated in the Title I program at the first grade level. (Data from one school was not included in the statewide analyses due to late processing of the data.) The results for these schools are shown in Tables 39-52.

2. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Grades 2-12)

The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests have two subtests, (viz., vocabulary and comprehension) for forms B and C and four subtests (viz., speed, accuracy, vocabulary, and comprehension) for forms D and E.

Form B was administered to second and third graders; Form C to fourth, fifth, and sixth graders; form D to seventh, eighth, and ninth graders; and form E to tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders.

At the second grade level, the schools that made the most significant gains on the vocabulary and comprehension subtests are listed below.

Vocabulary

1. Kihei
2. Paauilo
3. Kalaheo
4. Aiea
5. Laupahoehoe
6. Waihee
7. Kula
8. Holualoa
9. Maili

Comprehension

1. Waihee
2. Laupahoehoe
3. Wailuku
4. Maili
5. Hookena

There were twenty participating schools at this grade level, but the rest of them did not make significant progress on either the vocabulary or comprehension subtest (see Tables 53-56).

Of the 17 participating third grade classes those that made significant progress according to magnitude of the gains on the vocabulary and comprehension subtests are listed below.

Vocabulary

1. Honaunau
2. Aiea
3. Holualoa
4. Wailuku
5. Waimea
6. Makaha

Comprehension

1. Honaunau
2. Wailuku
3. Holualoa
4. Maili

The detailed results are found in Tables 57-60.

The most significant gains of the 13 fourth grade classes on the two subtests were achieved by:

Vocabulary

1. Kapaa
2. Keaukaha

Comprehension

1. Waimea
2. Kapaa
3. Holualoa

Results of the analyses of the data by subtest are presented more fully in Tables 61-64.

Of the 12 participating schools at the fifth grade level, only two obtained significant gains on the vocabulary subtest and only one on the comprehension subtest. These successful schools are listed below.

Vocabulary	Comprehension
1. Halawa	1. Keaukaha
2. Kula	

The generally nonsignificant gains could be largely due to the small number of cases involved in almost every project at this grade level. The results of the analyses are shown in Tables 65-68.

At the sixth grade level, three of the 11 participating schools made significant gains on the vocabulary subtest and four on the comprehension subtest.

Vocabulary	Comprehension
1. Kilohana	1. Aiea
2. Kapaa	2. Halawa
3. Halawa	3. Keaukaha
	4. Kapaa

For details of the results, see Tables 69-72.

Results for the seventh grade are found in Tables 73-80. Among the 10 participating schools those which showed gains on three of the four subtests are identified below. No seventh grade made significant gains on the vocabulary subtest.

Speed	Accuracy	Comprehension
1. Kalaheo	1. Holualoa	1. Honaunau
2. Holualoa	2. Honaunau	2. Waianae
3. Hilo Int.	3. Konawaena	3. Aiea
	4. Hilo Int.	4. Holualoa
		5. Hilo Int.

Again, that many of the observed gains were not statistically significant may have been due in part to rather small sample sizes.

As in the seventh grade, vocabulary subtest gains in the eighth grade classes were not significant. Among the seven participating schools at the eighth grade level, those that obtained significant gains on the three other subtests are enumerated below (see Tables 81-88 for detailed results).

Speed	Accuracy	Comprehension
1. Nanakuli	1. Holualoa	1. Holualoa
2. Konawaena	2. Honaunau	2. Waianae
3. Waianae	3. Konawaena	

At the ninth grade level, only one school (Konawaena) made significant gains on both the speed and accuracy subtests. None of the six participating schools made significant progress on either the vocabulary or comprehension subtests (see Tables 89-96).

Only three schools had data at the tenth grade level. Those which made significant improvement on each of the four subtests are as follows:

Speed	Accuracy	Vocabulary	Comprehension
1. Konawaena	1. Hilo	1. Kahuku	1. Konawaena
	2. Konawaena	2. Konawaena	

Details of the results are found in Tables 97-104.

At the eleventh grade level, three schools had data on all the four subtests and one other school had data only on the vocabulary and comprehension subtests. None of the gains were significant except the mean gain made by Konawaena on the accuracy subtest (see Tables 105-112).

At the twelfth grade level, only two schools were involved. The only statistically significant gain was made by Hilo High on the speed subtest (see Tables 113-120).

The criterion used in selecting the first ten (or less) schools was simply the relative magnitude of statistically significant gains. This does not necessarily mean that those selected schools scored highest on the posttest. For example, on the comprehension subtest (see Table 87) the Waianae eighth grade, with a posttest mean of only 16.00, was selected as a successful project, while the Honaunau eighth grade, with a posttest mean of 37.50 was not. This was in part due to the fact that the Honaunau sample involved only eight pupils.

At the upper grade levels, fewer schools obtained significant gains. This might not have been the case had it been possible to include all Title I project schools in the comparisons. Many schools could not be included in the comparative analyses because they had not obtained pretest data. The posttest data furnished by these schools were utilized only in the analyses comparing statewide 1968-69 posttest means with the corresponding 1969-70 posttest means.

3. Stanford Achievement Test (Grades 2-12)

It was not possible to compare schools by grade level on the Arithmetic Computation subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test because in some grades (3, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11) only one school participated and in three grades (2, 4, 5) only two schools participated (see Table 64). There were no data for grades seven and 12.

Individual schools that made significant gains at the indicated grade level were: Keaukaha (grade 2); Keaukaha and Hauula (grade 3);

Keaukaha (grade 5); and Konawaena (grades 9, 10, and 11). These schools had indicated that one of their objectives was to improve arithmetic and quantitative performance as measured by a standardized test.

4. School Attitude Inventory (Grades 4-12)

The School Attitude Inventory (SAI) was administered to all students in grades 4 through 12 in projects which had improvement of attitude toward school as one of their objectives. Since the SAI was used for all grade levels mentioned above and since the number of cases was small for many of the schools the data were analyzed for purposes of this report, by school, not by grade level.

The results are subject to various interpretations. Among the 26 schools involved, only two made significant gains on the SAI from pretest to posttest: McKinley High School and Kalaheo School. Their gains were significant at the $p \leq .05$ and $p \leq .01$ levels, respectively. These results, along with those of all other schools, are found in Tables 122 and 123.

Some of the schools demonstrated statistically significant decreases from pre- to posttest. This indicates deterioration of attitude toward school over the course of the school year. If there is a general tendency for students to become less enthusiastic about school during the course of the school year (regardless of the type of program), perhaps a change in the SAI testing schedule would show that deterioration in attitude under Title I programs is less than that observed in normal school programs. Thus, instead of giving the SAI pretest and posttest in the fall and spring of the same school year, the SAI posttest might be administered at the same relative time in

the school year as the pretest, but in the following school year. This should lead to more accurate assessment of the fifth objective.

It should be noted, however, that the posttest means on the SAI for grades four through eight were higher than the mean of the randomly selected 1968-69 Title I students who were used in the validation of the SAI. The means for grades four through eight of the 1969-70 Title I students ranged from 122.32 to 132.15 whereas the mean for the 1968-69 sample was only 119.17 (see Table 10 of this report and Table 68 of last year's final report). The means for grades 11 and 12 were about the same as that of the 1968-69 sample. Compared with the randomly selected 1968-69 Title I students who were tested also toward the end of the school year, the 1969-70 Title I groups did about equally well at two grade levels (11 and 12) and much better at five grade levels (4 through 8).

Except for grades nine and ten the rest of the grade levels' average scores were equal to or greater than four on the six-point SAI scale. A scale score of four is designated by the description "pretty much like me" for positive statements about school. The scale descriptions ranged from "not like me" (point one) to "very much like me" (point six). These descriptions are possible responses to items indicating an individual's general liking for school or school selected persons and activities (see EDRAD, 1969, for a more detailed description of the SAI items and scale). The general SAI responses of the 1969-70 Title I students indicate a general liking for school which may be described as "above average." (Title I participating schools should perhaps make more use of the SAI as an instrument for identifying individual students who are potential school dropouts.)

5. Outstanding Title I Projects

The 10 schools which made the greatest number of significant gains on the standardized tests, (MRT, G-MacGRT, and SAT where applicable) are listed by grade level below. The listing is not strictly rank ordered since each project had different numbers of participating classes at the various grade levels. For instance, some schools had four grades at the elementary level and others had three at the intermediate level. However, those schools which appear at the top of the list tended to have a greater number of significant gains at their respective grade levels than those at the bottom. The top 10 Title I projects are as follows:

1. Maili (grades K-3)
2. Wailuku (grades 1-3)
3. Konawaena (grades 7-11)
4. Holualoa (grades K-8)
5. Kapaa (grades 4,6)
6. Aiea Elem. (grades 1-6
7. Kapiolani (grades K-6)
8. Keaukaha (grades K-6)
9. Halawa (grades 4-6)
10. Hilo Inter. (grades 7-9)

For illustrative purposes the primary activities of several of the outstanding projects are described below. These descriptions may prove useful and informative to other projects in planning their future programs. The activities or services are briefly stated under each school, as reported by DOE (DOE official correspondence, Aug. 7, 1970).

Maili (grades K-3)

1. "Attendance at class for reading and language, held in school, headed by project teacher, averaging one hour or less per day;
2. "Presence of nurse or health coordinator"

Wailuku (grades 1-3)

1. "Attendance at class for reading and language, held in school, headed by project teacher, averaging one hour or less per day;

2. "Full time educational assistant working with small groups or individual children"

Konawaena High and Intermediate (grades 7-11)

1. "Provision of materials and equipment in special education classes;
2. "ETV hookup, unspecified usage;
3. "Attendance counselor or aide;
4. "Students trained as helpers in TV and instructional materials center;
5. "Resource center (equipment, supplies, toys) for children and teachers."

Kapiolani (grades K-6)

1. "After school study center/library;
2. "Full time educational assistant working with small groups or individual children;
3. "Counseling;
4. "Full time educational assistant working some with children, but more than half time on clerical, material production, study hall monitoring, etc.;
5. "Resource center (equipment, supplies, toys) for children and teachers;
6. "ETV hookup, unspecified usage."

Halawa (grades 4-6)

1. "Diagnosis of reading problems by task force or diagnostic team after referral of child from classroom and/or school;

2. "Attendance at class for reading/language, held in reading center, headed by project teacher, averaging one hour or less per day;
3. "Full time educational assistant working with small groups or individual children."

IV. Discussion

Interpretation of the findings of the foregoing analyses should be tempered by the knowledge that only about one-half of the data received from participating schools on the standardized tests contained pretest information. Results of the pretest-posttest analyses of the data received are therefore indicative of the performance of only about one-half of the Title I population in the State of Hawaii. All posttest data, including those without corresponding pretest data, were, however, utilized in the statewide posttest comparison between 1968-69 and 1969-70 Title I groups, by grade level, on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests. These comparisons show the posttest performance of the total Title I population this school year relative to the posttest performance of last year's population on the two standardized tests. Results of the 1968-69 and 1969-70 posttest-posttest comparisons are better indicators of the performance of the total Title I students.

As mentioned earlier the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (for grades Pre-1) and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (for grades 2-12) were administered to schools which indicated as their objectives one or more of the following: (1) to improve performance as measured by standardized tests (language arts), (2) to improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations, and (3) to improve verbal functioning. Results of statewide analyses, by grade level, of 1969-70 pretest-posttest gain and posttest-posttest comparisons, by grade level, between 1968-69 and 1969-70 Title I populations indicate that the above-mentioned objectives have been satisfactorily achieved.

Inspection of Tables 2-6 reveals that most gains were made in the lower grades. Three explanations, not mutually exclusive, are offered to account for this observation: (1) the particular remedial programs used with lower grade pupils were more effective than those used with upper grade students, (2) younger children are more receptive to external intervention designed to improve their academic performance, and (3) the tests were more suited for assessing instructional objectives in the lower grades.

The fourth objective of the Title I Program was to improve performance as measured by standardized tests (arithmetic and quantitative skills). Analyses of the data relevant to this objective were based on only 206 pupils from three schools. Thus, results from these analyses are not generalizable to the quantitative performance of the whole Title I population.

Significant results were obtained at four out of nine grade levels (see Table 7). Thus, whether the fourth objective of the Title I Program was generally attained is not clear.

Analyses of SAI data should also be interpreted with caution since 661 students (about one-third of the total SAI respondents) were excluded from the statewide analyses, due to missing pretest or posttest data. Results of the analyses of available data, however, strongly suggest that the fifth objective of the Title I Program (viz., to improve attitude toward school) has not been met. There are a number of possible explanations for this apparent lack of improvement in attitude toward school. First, the remedial programs may not have been potent enough to modify Title I students' attitudes toward school. Second, the attitudes measured by the SAI may be too strong to be altered in the course of four or five months. Third, students probably have a stronger liking

for school at the beginning of the school year than toward the end (significant decreases in mean SAI scores were observed in the seventh, ninth, and tenth grade levels--see Table 10). If this is the case, the SAI pretest and posttests might better be administered in the fall of two consecutive school years. In summary, further investigation is needed to determine the reasons underlying this observed lack of improvement in attitude toward school by Title I students.

The most successful individual projects were identified in terms of the magnitude and number of significant gains made. There was, among the most successful projects, commonality in the types of activities or services they rendered to students. For instance, providing a special class for reading and language and establishing a resource center for children and teachers were mentioned by most of the first ten outstanding projects as part of the services they offered. Many of the top projects also reported hiring the services of either part-time or full-time educational assistants who worked with the children either individually or in small groups. It might be helpful to the less successful projects to obtain detailed accounts of the content and procedures used in some of the more successful projects; these contents and procedures might then be modified to suit their own project situations and goals.

Twenty-six projects had as one of their objectives the improvement of students' attitude toward school, yet only two schools (viz., McKinley High and Kalaheo Elementary) made significant mean gains on the SAI. In this regard, it is interesting to note that McKinley High School provided a special class for students with behavior and learning problems and Kalaheo Elementary School used counseling as a remedial procedure. Since none of the other 24 schools, in the state of Hawaii, made significant mean gains on the SAI, considering their total Title I students regardless

of grade level, information relative to the content and procedures employed by McKinley and Kalaheo might wisely be disseminated to other interested project schools.

V. Summary and Recommendations

Statewide analyses of available data indicate that the first three objectives of the Title I Program--viz., (1) to improve performance as measured by standardized tests (language arts), (2) to improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations, and (3) to improve verbal functioning--have been satisfactorily met. Regarding the fourth objective--viz., to improve performance as measured by standardized tests (arithmetic and quantitative skills), the findings were inconclusive, since data were sent in by only three schools on 206 students and significant gains were made at only four out of nine grade levels. The fifth and last objective--viz., to improve students' attitude toward school--was not generally attained. As mentioned previously, about a third of the SAI data sent in for pretest-posttest analyses could not be used, due to missing pretest and/or posttest scores. This fact somewhat tempers the generality of the conclusion regarding Title I students' attitude toward school. These findings should be supplemented by evaluation reports from the individual participating schools.

Comparison of the individual projects permitted identification of the 10 most successful projects in terms of number and magnitude of significant gains made. In an attempt to identify the most effective remedial programs, services and/or activities conducted by the majority of these more successful schools were briefly described.

For a more adequate evaluation of the total Title I Program in Hawaii the following recommendations are presented for possible implementation in the next school year:

(1) that the standardized tests be ordered much earlier and be administered early in the school year (i.e., by late September);

(2) that the School Attitude Inventory (SAI) posttest be administered exactly a year after the pretest, in order to control influences such as the general tendency for all students to become less enthusiastic about school as the school year progresses; and

(3) that regional conferences be held with representatives from the more successful projects in order to disseminate the content and procedures adopted by these more effective projects.

References

Department of Education (DOE) official correspondence, August 7, 1970.

Education Research and Development Center (EDRAD). Evaluative Data Pertaining to Certain Objectives of 1968-69 Title I (P.L. 89-10) Projects Conducted by the Hawaii State Department of Education (Final Report). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, August, 1969.

Gates, I. A., & MacGinitie, W. H. Teacher's Manual, Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1965.

Hildreth, G. H., Griffiths, N. L., & McGauvran, M. E. Manual of Directions, Metropolitan Readiness Tests. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1965, 1966, 1969.

Kelley, T. L., Madden, R., Gardner, E. F., & Rudman, H. C. Stanford Achievement Test (manual). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.

APPENDIX

SCHOOL ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Name:_____ School:_____

Grade: _____ Date: _____

INSTRUCTIONS:

Fill out the blanks above with your name, grade, school, and today's date. Do this now.

On the following pages you will find 30 statements about what you think and how you feel about school. Read each statement very carefully, and then decide how much each statement is like you or not like you. Then check your answer on the space provided under each statement.

This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer honestly so that your teachers and counselors will be able to understand you better and help you more with your problems. Your answers will not in any way affect your grades in school.

EXAMPLE 1

I love school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

If you love school, mark an "X" on the line above "very much like me." If you do not love school, mark an "X" on the line above "not like me." If the statement is slightly like you or quite like you, then mark an "X" on the line above your answer. Mark your answer now.

EXAMPLE 2

I don't like playing in school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

If you don't like playing in school, then your answer should be "very much like me." But if you like playing in school, your answer should be "not like me." If your answer is somewhere in-between, mark an "X" on the line above your answer. Do it now. Are there any questions? If none, then turn the page over and begin.

1. I can work alone for a period of time.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

2. I complete my work not finished the day before.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

3. I do my school work most of the time.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

4. I read without anybody telling me to.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

5. I enjoy books, newspapers, and magazines.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

6. I carry out my work until it is finished.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

7. When I study, I easily get bothered by things going on around me.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

8. I know that I can do what the teacher wants me to do.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

9. I am interested in the results of my work.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

10. I stick with a job until finished.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

11. I like most of my teachers.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

12. I don't feel like doing school work.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

13. I come to school almost every day when there's school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

14. I do extra school work.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

15. I hate school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

16. I get right down to work if I have studying to do.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

17. I usually get my classwork in early.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

18. In class I often look out the window or at things around the room.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	very much like me

19. I find learning new things interesting.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

20. I like to go to school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

21. I think school is fun.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

22. I think school work is not useful.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

23. I would like to leave school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

24. I am doing well in school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

25. It's nice to be in school.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

26. I think teachers give us too much work.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

27. I think school is like a prison or jail.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

28. I think teachers are not interested in me.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

29. I think school is important.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

30. School is not pleasant.

Not like me	Slightly like me	Somewhat like me	Pretty much like me	Quite like me	Very much like me

List of Designated Code Numbers of 1969-70 Title I Projects

Honolulu District

Code No.	Project
101	Anuenue
102	Fern
103	Kaahumanu
104	Kaewai
105	Kaiulani
107	Kalihi-kai
108	Kalihi-waena
109	Kauluwela
110	Lanakila
111	Likelike
112	Linapuni
113	Palolo
114	Puuhale
115	Royal
116	Central Inter.
117	S.B. Dole Inter.
118	Jarrett Inter.
119	Kalakaua Inter.
120	Washington Inter.
121	W.R. Farrington Hi
122	Kaimuki Hi
123	McKinley Hi
125	St. Anthony's

Leeward District

Code No.	Project
201	Nanaikapono Pre.
202	Waianae Elem.
203	Maili Elem.
206	Nanaikapono Elem.
207	Waianae Inter.
208	Nanakuli Hi & Inter.
209	Waianae Hi
210	Makaha

Windward District

Code No.	Project
302	Hauula
303	Kaaawa Elem.
304	Kahaluu
305	Kahuku Hi & Elem.
306	Laie
307	Blanche Pope Elem.
308	Waiahole Elem. & Inter.
309	Benjamin Parker
310	Waimanalo Elem.

Central District

Code No.	Project
401	Halawa Elem.
402	Waialua Elem.
403	Aiea Elem.
404	Wahiawa
405	Haleiwa Elem.
406	Aiea Inter.
407	Waialua Hi & Inter.
408	Aiea Hi
409	St. Michael's

Hawaii District

Code No.	Project
701	Hilo Hi
702	Hilo Inter.
703	Holualoa Elem.
704	Honaunau
705	Hookena
706	Kapiolani Elem.
708	Keaukaha Elem.
710	Konawaena Hi & Inter.
711	Laupahoehoe Hi & Elem.
712	Naalehu
713	Paauilo Elem. & Inter.
714	Pahoa Hi & Elem.

Maui District

Code No.	Project
602	Waihee Elem.
603	Kula Elem.
604	Kihei Sch.
605	Paia Elem.
607	Wailuku Elem.
609	Kilohana Elem.
610	Hana Hi & Elem.

Kauai District

Code No.	Project
501	Waimea Elem.
502	Koloa
503	Kapaa Elem.
504	Kapaa Hi & Inter.
505	Hanalei
506	Kalaheo

Table 1

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1968-69 and 1969-70 Post-test Data (Grades 1-12) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests and Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests

Grade	Test	1968-69 N	1968-69 Mean	1968-69 SD	1969-70 N	1969-70 Mean	1969-70 SD	z ratio
K	Metropolitan	319			340			
	Word meaning		6.880	2.560		6.700	2.610	0.894
	Listening		8.070	2.630		7.690	2.810	1.793
	Matching		7.720	3.370		7.590	3.540	0.483
	Alphabet		8.410	4.880		9.290	4.990	-2.288*
	Numbers		9.250	3.890		8.940	4.390	0.961
	Copying		5.310	3.830		4.650	3.720	2.242*
	Total		45.670	16.480		44.770	17.560	0.679
1	Metropolitan	391			594			
	Word meaning		8.310	2.420		7.670	2.380	4.088**
	Listening		9.630	2.640		9.650	2.590	-0.117
	Matching		10.630	2.690		10.490	2.770	0.790
	Alphabet		13.700	3.420		13.540	3.440	0.717
	Numbers		13.290	3.800		13.100	3.770	0.770
	Copying		8.250	3.000		7.910	3.100	1.717
	Total		63.770	12.510		62.300	12.300	1.816
2	Gates-Mac. Pr (B)	330			459			
	Vocabulary		17.020	7.380		17.100	8.360	-0.142
	Comprehension		9.660	4.780		9.650	5.710	0.027
3	Gates-Mac. Pr (B)	331			426			
	Vocabulary		24.520	8.650		24.270	9.880	0.371
	Comprehension		13.510	6.940		14.230	7.570	-1.550
4	Gates-Mac. Pr (C)	200			297			
	Vocabulary		26.100	7.880		24.570	8.300	2.077*
	Comprehension		20.450	8.160		18.360	8.040	2.817**
5	Gates-Mac. Pr (C)	197			189			
	Vocabulary		32.190	7.870		28.720	8.780	4.083**
	Comprehension		26.640	9.220		22.450	8.430	4.663**
6	Gates-Mac. Pr (C)	152			180			
	Vocabulary		35.220	9.280		34.620	8.520	0.609
	Comprhension		31.200	9.390		28.780	10.460	2.220*
7	Gates-Mac. Sur (D)	239			301			
	Speed		17.760	7.320		19.110	7.860	-2.060*
	Accuracy		14.510	5.920		15.100	6.000	-1.143
	Vocabulary		23.720	8.500		22.720	7.930	1.399
	Comprehension		28.650	10.850		27.710	9.850	1.041
8	Gates-Mac. Sur (D)	175			168			
	Speed		22.110	8.700		22.840	8.090	-0.805
	Accuracy		18.230	8.270		18.110	7.420	0.142
	Vocabulary		24.940	8.980		24.870	9.040	0.072
	Comprehension		31.150	11.420		29.210	11.850	1.543
9	Gates-Mac. Sur (D)	133			176			
	Speed		22.930	9.130		23.900	8.340	-0.960
	Accuracy		18.380	8.050		19.880	8.040	-1.623

Grade	Test	1968-69 N	Mean	SD	1969-70 N	Mean	SD	z ratio
K	Metropolitan	319			340			
	Word meaning		6.880	2.560		6.700	2.610	0.894
	Listening		8.070	2.630		7.690	2.810	1.793
	Matching		7.720	3.370		7.590	3.540	0.483
	Alphabet		8.410	4.880		9.290	4.990	-2.288*
	Numbers		9.250	3.890		8.940	4.390	0.961
	Copying		5.310	3.830		4.650	3.720	2.242*
	Total		45.670	16.480		44.770	17.560	0.679
1	Metropolitan	391			594			
	Word meaning		8.310	2.420		7.670	2.380	4.088**
	Listening		9.630	2.640		9.650	2.590	-0.117
	Matching		10.630	2.690		10.490	2.770	0.790
	Alphabet		13.700	3.420		13.540	3.440	0.717
	Numbers		13.290	3.800		13.100	3.770	0.770
	Copying		8.250	3.000		7.910	3.100	1.717
	Total		63.770	12.510		62.300	12.300	1.816
2	Gates-Mac. Pr (B)	330			459			
	Vocabulary		17.020	7.380		17.100	8.360	-0.142
	Comprehension		9.660	4.780		9.650	5.710	0.027
3	Gates-Mac. Pr (B)	331			426			
	Vocabulary		24.520	8.650		24.270	9.880	0.371
	Comprehension		13.510	6.940		14.330	7.570	-1.550
4	Gates-Mac. Pr (C)	200			297			
	Vocabulary		26.100	7.880		24.570	8.300	2.077*
	Comprehension		20.450	8.160		18.360	8.040	2.817**
5	Gates-Mac. Pr (C)	197			189			
	Vocabulary		32.190	7.870		28.720	8.780	4.083**
	Comprehension		26.640	9.220		22.450	8.430	4.663**
6	Gates-Mac. Pr (C)	152			180			
	Vocabulary		35.220	9.280		34.620	8.520	0.609
	Comprhension		31.200	9.390		28.780	10.460	2.220*
7	Gates-Mac. Sur (D)	239			301			
	Speed		17.760	7.320		19.110	7.860	-2.060*
	Accuracy		14.510	5.920		15.100	6.000	-1.143
	Vocabulary		23.720	8.500		22.720	7.930	1.399
	Comprehension		28.650	10.850		27.710	9.850	1.041
8	Gates-Mac. Sur (D)	175			168			
	Speed		22.110	8.700		22.840	8.090	-0.805
	Accuracy		18.230	8.270		18.110	7.420	0.142
	Vocabulary		24.940	8.980		24.870	9.040	0.072
	Comprehension		31.150	11.420		29.210	11.850	1.543
9	Gates-Mac. Sur (D)	133			176			
	Speed		22.930	9.130		23.900	8.340	-0.960
	Accuracy		18.380	8.050		19.880	8.040	-1.623
	Vocabulary		24.890	8.480		26.810	9.040	-1.915
	Comprehension		30.710	11.630		32.280	11.780	-1.168
10	Gates-Mac. Sur (E)	160			84			
	Speed		17.920	8.060		21.460	7.850	-3.316**
	Accuracy		13.010	5.310		16.650	6.420	-4.457**
	Vocabulary		16.950	6.480		18.000	6.200	-1.237
	Comprehension		24.230	8.980		23.990	9.650	0.189
11	Gates-Mac. Sur (E)	118			53			
	Speed		20.420	8.240		19.380	8.600	0.741
	Accuracy		14.780	6.500		15.550	7.940	-0.619
	Vocabulary		19.020	7.180		19.530	5.030	-0.533
	Comprehension		26.140	10.070		28.090	10.740	-1.119
12	Gates-Mac. Sur (E)	139			23			
	Speed		21.400	8.920		20.700	7.490	0.403
	Accuracy		16.500	7.520		15.910	6.740	0.332
	Vocabulary		19.990	6.060		19.830	9.720	0.077
	Comprehension		28.570	8.380		28.960	12.070	-0.142

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 2

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades Pre-1) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests

		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
Grade	Subtest	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
Pre	Word meaning	6.15	1.80	7.88	1.63	1.73	25	3.54**
	Listening	8.96	2.03	8.31	2.26	-0.65	25	1.33
	Matching	4.85	2.15	6.31	1.89	1.46	25	2.82**
	Alphabet	4.35	2.21	5.00	2.55	0.65	25	0.99
	Numbers	5.85	2.48	8.35	3.51	2.50	25	3.57**
	Copying	0.92	1.60	1.62	2.30	0.69	25	2.46*
	Total	31.04	5.86	37.46	9.14	6.42	25	4.04**
K	Word meaning	6.17	2.52	6.97	2.79	0.80	229	4.55**
	Listening	8.08	2.67	8.05	2.90	-0.03	229	0.18
	Matching	6.10	3.31	8.00	3.66	1.90	229	9.57**
	Alphabet	6.36	4.77	9.98	5.15	3.62	229	15.45**
	Numbers	7.97	4.42	9.79	4.64	1.82	229	8.61**
	Copying	3.59	3.46	5.50	3.29	1.91	229	9.48**
	Total	38.20	16.06	48.29	18.59	10.09	229	16.37**
1	Word meaning	6.97	2.22	7.82	2.38	0.84	521	6.89**
	Listening	9.05	2.41	9.74	2.57	0.69	521	5.39**
	Matching	8.81	3.17	10.54	2.79	1.73	521	12.96**
	Alphabet	11.16	4.33	13.59	3.41	2.43	521	17.18**
	Numbers	11.13	3.88	13.02	3.74	1.89	521	12.83**
	Copying	6.89	3.42	7.90	3.13	1.01	521	7.13**
	Total	53.98	13.08	62.50	12.40	8.52	521	20.68**

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 3

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades 2-3) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Primary B)

		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
Grade	Subtest	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
2	Vocab	13.48	7.23	18.08	8.13	4.60	162	9.25**
	Compre	9.01	5.09	10.75	5.68	1.74	162	4.08**
3	Vocab	20.97	9.64	24.49	10.10	3.52	127	7.32**
	Compre	13.10	6.68	15.15	7.59	2.05	127	4.63**

**Significant at or beyond .01 level

Table 4

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades 4-6) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Primary C)

		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
Grade	Subtest	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
4	Vocab	25.29	7.73	27.05	8.14	1.76	95	3.96**
	Compre	19.16	7.19	21.44	8.36	2.28	95	3.61**
5	Vocab	29.59	7.97	31.27	9.08	1.68	90	3.16**
	Compre	22.65	8.45	23.82	8.90	1.18	90	2.04*
6	Vocab	35.18	8.05	36.95	8.29	1.77	93	3.92**
	Compre	28.13	9.96	30.86	10.54	2.73	93	4.21**

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 5

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades 7-9) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Survey D)

		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
Grade	Subtest	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
7	Speed	16.35	6.75	19.09	7.99	2.75	149	4.20**
	Accuracy	12.69	4.42	15.06	5.80	2.37	149	6.50**
	Vocab	23.52	7.25	22.73	7.73	-0.79	149	1.65
	Compre	24.51	8.56	28.25	9.50	3.74	149	6.27**
8	Speed	16.17	7.98	22.15	9.68	5.98	52	4.57**
	Accuracy	11.49	5.60	14.45	7.11	2.96	52	4.53**
	Vocab	19.94	8.87	19.87	9.65	-0.08	52	0.10
	Compre	20.53	11.53	22.94	11.99	2.42	52	2.52**
9	Speed	20.04	6.19	24.74	8.27	4.70	105	6.16**
	Accuracy	17.17	6.29	21.23	8.19	4.06	105	8.04**
	Vocab	28.18	8.13	28.30	8.70	0.12	105	0.29
	Compre	33.54	10.19	33.70	11.59	0.16	105	0.26

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 6

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades 10-12) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Survey E)

		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
Grade	Subtest	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
10	Speed	19.34	9.33	23.91	7.46	4.57	57	3.36**
	Accuracy	13.52	7.43	17.21	6.78	3.69	57	4.91**
	Vocab	16.29	5.74	17.21	5.72	0.91	57	1.65
	Compre	22.86	9.72	22.71	8.86	-0.16	57	0.18
11	Speed	19.29	9.35	19.12	8.92	-0.18	33	0.13
	Accuracy	14.71	7.48	15.03	8.58	0.32	33	0.33
	Vocab	19.47	5.94	18.94	5.27	-0.53	33	0.78
	Compre	29.00	10.32	27.82	9.78	-1.18	33	0.94
12	Speed	16.00	7.24	20.80	8.34	4.80	9	2.38*
	Accuracy	13.80	6.30	16.40	6.17	2.60	9	1.63
	Vocab	22.00	9.88	21.70	10.34	-0.30	9	0.18
	Compre	31.00	13.14	30.80	12.16	-0.20	9	0.10

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 7

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades 2-11) on the Stanford Achievement Test (Arithmetic Computation Subtest)

	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
Grade	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
2	30.50	10.30	31.39	9.83	0.89	27	1.12
3	38.25	4.79	38.00	9.93	-0.25	3	0.08
4	27.05	12.37	33.23	13.74	6.18	21	2.83**
5	30.71	11.89	33.10	15.58	2.38	20	1.31
6	18.00	6.65	20.11	8.70	2.11	8	1.22
8	13.80	2.77	15.20	4.44	1.40	4	0.61
9	17.82	6.79	18.76	6.94	0.94	71	2.01*
10	12.00	5.53	13.48	5.96	1.48	43	2.95**
11	10.63	4.00	12.13	4.42	1.50	7	2.29*

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 8

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades 4-12) on the School Attitude Inventory (4-month interval)

	PRE-TEST Mid-Nov. 1969		POST-TEST Mid-March 1970		TESTING INTERVAL Four Months		
Grade	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
4	134.11	17.35	133.00	16.00	-1.11	18	0.27
5	136.68	18.83	131.57	22.57	-5.11	27	1.96
6	128.67	25.25	127.22	24.36	-1.44	26	0.39
7	129.29	22.84	125,35	23.82	-3.94	139	2.30*
8	122.69	25.44	122.64	27.51	-0.05	119	0.03
9	124.44	14.89	118.33	17.67	-6.10	38	2.24*
10	119.04	22.61	114.78	24.70	-4.25	109	2.41*
11	115.01	23.32	117.75	22.75	2.74	102	1.62
12	119.44	19.75	19.76	22.89	0.32	62	0.13

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 9

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades 4-12) on the School Attitude Inventory (5-month interval)

	PRE-TEST Mid-Nov. 1969		POST-TEST Mid-April 1970		TESTING INTERVAL Five Months		
Grade	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
4	130.58	24.50	131.81	23.86	1.23	47	0.32
5	128.41	27.78	128.59	20.43	0.18	48	0.05
6	131.27	26.32	132.46	20.85	1.20	40	0.30
7	125.85	21.74	124.85	25.51	-1.01	70	0.38
8	120.04	22.07	120.96	23.52	0.93	27	0.21
9	117.63	26.02	111.95	27.57	-5.68	120	2.84*
10	118.51	19.98	108.08	26.20	-10.43	48	3.38*
11	112.95	30.30	113.00	22.00	0.05	18	0.02

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 10

Analyses of Statewide Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Grades 4-12) on the School Attitude Inventory (Both testing intervals)

	PRE-TEST Mid-Nov. 1969		POST-TEST Mid-April 1970		AVERAGE TESTING INTERVAL 4½ Months		
Grade	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
4	131.58	22.63	132.15	21.92	0.57	66	0.19
5	131.42	25.09	129.68	21.13	-1.74	76	0.65
6	130.24	25.74	130.38	22.29	0.15	67	0.05
7	128.13	22.49	125.18	24.34	-2.96	210	2.04*
8	122.19	24.79	122.32	26.73	0.14	147	0.09
9	119.29	23.93	113.51	26.61	-5.78	159	3.51**
10	118.87	21.77	112.72	25.28	-6.16	158	3.95**
11	114.69	24.41	117.01	22.61	2.32	121	1.54
12	119.72	19.75	119.61	22.74	-0.11	63	0.05

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 11

Analyses of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Word Meaning Subtest)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
308	Waiahole	5.71	1.79	7.53	1.62	1.82	16	2.97**
505	Hanalei	7.00	1.58	8.56	1.51	1.56	8	1.83
610	Hana	7.40	1.78	3.90	2.08	-3.50	9	4.87**

Table 12

Analysis of Regression of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Word Meaning Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	0.154	0.154	0.056
Residual	24	66.500	2.771	
Total	25	66.654		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 13

Analyses of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Listening Subtest)

School	PRE-TEST (01-19-70) Mean	SD	POST-TEST (05-11-70) Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
308 Waiahole	8.59	2.27	8.29	2.08	-0.29	16	0.50
505 Hanalei	9.67	1.32	8.33	2.69	-1.33	8	1.51
610 Hana	9.30	1.83	3.80	2.44	-5.50	9	6.60**

Table 14

Analysis of Regression of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Listening Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	12.803	12.803	2.678
Residual	24	114.735	4.781	
Total	25	127.539		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 15

Analyses of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Matching Subtest)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
308	Waiahole	4.00	1.27	5.76	1.92	1.76	16	2.92**
505	Hanalei	6.44	2.60	7.33	1.41	0.89	8	0.90
610	Hana	6.40	4.67	0.40	0.52	-6.00	9	4.22*

Table 16

Analysis of Regression of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Matching Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Square	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	2.010	2.010	0.551
Residual	24	87.528	3.647	
Total	25	89.539		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 17

Analyses of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Alphabet Subtest)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
308	Waiahole	4.88	2.26	5.29	2.95	0.41	16	0.46
505	Hanalei	3.33	1.80	4.44	1.51	1.11	8	1.14
610	Hana	4.00	2.87	4.30	4.03	0.30	9	0.26

Table 18

Analysis of Regression of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Alphabet Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	0.008	0.008	0.001
Residual	24	161.992	6.750	
Total	25	162.000		

Table 19

Analyses of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Two Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Numbers Subtest)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
308	Waiahole	5.06	1.95	6.82	2.21	1.76	16	3.19**
505	Hanalei	7.33	2.78	11.22	3.80	3.89	8	2.28

Table 20

Analysis of Regression of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Two Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Numbers Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	33.222	33.222	2.903
Residual	24	274.663	11.444	
Total	25	307.885		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 21

Analyses of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Copying Subtest)

School	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
308 Waiahole	0.59	1.50	0.82	1.74	0.24	16	1.29
505 Hanalei	1.56	1.67	3.11	2.57	1.56++	8	2.33*
610 Hana	2.90	2.47	1.10	2.85	-1.80	9	3.52*

Table 22

Analysis of Regression of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Copying Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	81.716	81.716	38.884**
Residual	24	50.437	2.102	
Total	25	132.154		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 23

Analyses of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Two Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Total Score)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
308	Waiahole	28.76	5.70	34.53	7.67	5.76	16	3.60**
505	Hanalei	35.33	3.28	43.00	9.51	7.67	8	2.14

Table 24

Analysis of Regression of Preschool Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Two Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Total Score)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	491.175	491.175	7.389*
Residual	24	1595.290	66.470	
Total	25	2086.465		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 25

Analyses of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (23 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Word Meaning Subtest)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-10-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
101	Anuenue	2.60	1.07	3.20	1.48	0.60	9	0.97
103	Kaahumanu	6.35	1.93	6.40	1.23	0.05	19	0.09
105	Kaiulani	4.85	1.72	5.54	2.99	0.69	12	0.81
109	Kauluwela	5.14	1.35	6.43	3.99	1.29	6	1.01
110	Lanakila	5.91	2.17	6.55	2.70	0.64	10	0.61
111	Likelike	4.94	1.34	5.44	1.55	0.50	15	1.04
115	Royal	6.31	1.32	6.08	2.43	-0.23	12	0.31
203	Maili	8.21	1.87	9.74	2.23	1.53++	18	2.41*
206	Nanakuli El.	6.39	2.23	6.42	1.66	0.03	35	0.06
303	Kaaawa	4.00	0.00	7.50	0.71	3.50	1	7.00
306	Laie	4.70	1.57	5.30	2.67	0.60	9	0.57
310	Waimanalo	5.00	1.73	4.67	4.62	-0.33	2	0.20
404	Wahiawa	5.91	2.63	6.27	2.05	0.36	10	0.56
502	Koloa	8.93	2.76	10.34	2.69	1.41++	28	3.42**
603	Kula	5.50	2.12	6.00	2.83	0.50	1	1.00
703	Holualoa	6.00	4.24	9.50	3.54	3.50	1	7.00
704	Honaunau	4.50	1.07	8.25	1.28	3.75++	7	5.79**
705	Hookena	5.88	1.73	6.38	1.85	0.50	7	0.45
706	Kapiolani	5.71	1.94	6.18	1.85	0.46	27	0.98
708	Keaukaha	7.33	3.28	7.11	1.54	-0.22	8	0.17
711	Laupahoehoe	4.89	2.71	6.56	1.42	1.67	8	2.04
713	Paauilo	6.44	2.65	6.22	2.11	-0.22	8	0.20
714	Pahoa	5.67	0.52	6.00	1.90	0.33	5	0.44

Table 26

Analysis of Regression of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (23 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Word Meaning Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	456.608	456.608	78.265**
Residual	228	1330.181	5.834	
Total	229	1786.789		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 27

Analyses of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (23 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Listening Subtest)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
101 Anuenue	3.50	1.58	2.50	2.42	-1.00	9	0.92
103 Kaahumanu	7.25	2.34	8.60	2.37	1.35++	19	2.74**
105 Kaiulani	6.69	2.36	6.69	3.52	0.00	12	0.00
109 Kauluwela	7.71	2.43	7.57	2.99	-0.14	6	0.10
110 Lanakila	8.55	2.62	8.18	3.40	-0.36	10	0.39
111 Likelike	7.94	1.48	7.19	2.10	-0.75	15	1.13
115 Royal	7.15	2.27	8.08	1.44	0.92	12	1.41
203 Maili	9.53	2.39	11.21	2.07	1.68++	18	2.37*
206 Nanakuli El	8.33	1.84	7.19	2.33	-1.14	35	2.44*
303 Kaaawa	6.50	2.12	6.50	0.71	0.00	1	0.00
306 Laie	10.47	1.78	9.26	2.38	-1.21	18	1.93
310 Waimanalo	8.67	1.15	7.67	1.53	-1.00	2	0.65
404 Wahiawa	7.18	2.60	6.64	2.11	-0.55	10	0.86
502 Koloa	10.28	2.55	10.66	1.65	0.38	28	0.72
603 Kula	11.00	0.00	9.00	2.83	-2.00	1	1.00
703 Holualoa	10.00	1.41	9.00	2.83	-1.00	1	0.33
704 Honaunau	7.50	2.83	8.25	2.25	0.75	7	0.94
705 Hookena	9.13	1.13	7.25	1.49	-1.88++	7	2.71*
706 Kapiolani	7.57	2.25	6.36	2.41	-1.21	27	2.33*
708 Keaukaha	7.67	2.12	8.67	2.45	1.00	8	1.10
711 Laupahoehoe	9.11	2.26	8.67	2.69	-0.44	8	0.49
713 Paauilo	6.22	1.86	8.44	2.13	2.22++	8	4.26**
714 Pahoa	8.83	2.32	7.67	2.34	-1.17	5	1.12

Table 28

Analysis of Regression of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (23 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Listening Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	382.636	382.636	56.509**
Residual	228	1543.841	6.771	
Total	229	1926.477		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression.

Table 29

Analyses of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Matching Subtest)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
101	Anuenue	2.90	2.51	3.40	3.63	0.50	9	0.86
103	Kaahumanu	7.40	2.91	8.70	2.72	1.30	19	1.86
109	Kauluwela	6.57	1.72	8.71	3.59	2.14	6	2.17
110	Lanakila	8.09	4.37	7.36	4.76	-0.73	10	0.84
111	Likelike	5.44	2.63	6.88	3.58	1.44	15	1.72
115	Royal	4.92	2.53	7.54	2.70	2.62	12	4.87**
203	Maili	9.74	3.26	11.95	1.58	2.21++	18	3.81**
206	Nanakuli El.	6.14	2.00	7.50	2.65	1.36	35	2.51*
303	Kaaawa	7.00	2.83	4.50	4.95	-2.50	1	1.67
306	Laie	5.80	2.78	6.90	2.47	1.10	9	1.01
310	Waimanalo	7.33	3.51	10.00	2.00	2.67	2	1.44
404	Wahiawa	4.36	1.36	5.64	2.84	1.27	10	1.55
502	Koloa	9.62	2.51	11.28	2.09	1.66++	28	3.82**
603	Kula	3.50	0.71	7.50	4.95	4.00	1	1.00
703	Holualoa	7.00	1.41	11.00	1.41	4.00	1	4.00
704	Honaunau	4.88	3.52	11.13	2.59	6.25++	7	4.64**
705	Hookena	3.38	2.20	6.25	1.75	2.88	7	3.54**
706	Kapiolani	4.21	1.71	5.64	3.23	1.43	27	3.22**
708	Keaukaha	3.67	1.00	6.11	3.06	2.44	8	2.82*
711	Laupahoehoe	4.44	2.40	6.78	2.99	2.33	8	2.27*
713	Paauilo	4.00	1.73	8.67	2.35	4.67++	8	4.13**
714	Pahoa	5.00	1.79	6.67	2.88	1.67	5	0.97

Table 30

Analysis of Regression of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Matching Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1228.610	1228.610	152.457**
Residual	228	1837.390	8.059	
Total	229	3066.000		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 31

Analyses of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Alphabet Subtest)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
			SD					
101	Anuenue	3.10	4.53	3.40	4.79	0.30	9	0.38
103	Kaahumanu	6.65	4.08	10.15	4.84	3.50	19	3.64**
109	Kauluwela	6.43	2.64	10.71	3.30	4.29++	6	3.67**
110	Lanakila	9.91	6.07	12.36	4.67	2.45	10	2.10
111	Likelike	4.00	2.13	7.81	3.78	3.81	15	4.47**
115	Royal	6.31	4.05	8.62	4.87	2.31	12	3.33**
203	Maili	13.63	2.54	15.84	0.50	2.21	18	3.81**
206	Nanakuli El.	5.61	2.89	8.58	3.82	2.97	35	4.09**
303	Kaaawa	7.00	2.83	7.00	7.07	0.00	1	0.00
306	Laie	2.10	2.60	7.10	3.87	5.00+	9	5.59**
310	Waimanalo	7.67	4.73	11.67	6.66	4.00	2	1.51
404	Wahiawa	5.00	4.47	9.36	4.70	4.36+	10	3.76**
502	Koloa	10.07	3.51	15.52	0.69	5.45++	28	8.66**
603	Kula	2.00	2.83	12.50	2.12	10.50++	1	21.00*
703	Holualoa	12.00	5.66	15.50	0.71	3.50	1	1.00
704	Honaunau	6.63	6.00	10.00	5.18	3.38	7	2.50*
705	Hookena	4.50	1.51	5.88	3.44	1.38	7	1.25
706	Kapiolani	3.25	2.68	6.39	3.87	3.14	27	5.76**
708	Keaukaha	3.00	2.50	7.22	4.84	4.22	8	3.83**
711	Laupahoehoe	6.11	3.59	10.78	3.19	4.67++	8	6.11**
713	Paauilo	2.11	2.15	10.33	3.46	8.22++	8	6.28**
714	Pahoa	4.33	1.63	7.33	5.85	3.00	5	1.53

Table 32

Analysis of Regression of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Alphabet Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	3388.337	3388.337	287.130**
Residual	228	2690.558	11.801	
Total	229	6078.895		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 33

Analyses of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Numbers Subtest)

SCHOOL		PRE TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
101	Anuenue	4.80	3.79	3.50	3.57	-1.30	9	1.14
103	Kaahumanu	6.70	2.75	9.65	2.23	2.95+	19	3.96**
109	Pauluwela	7.00	4.58	9.57	2.70	2.57	6	1.97
110	Lanakila	11.36	5.66	14.09	5.01	2.73++	10	3.46**
111	Likelike	5.63	2.90	7.06	3.11	1.44	15	2.00
115	Royal	7.69	5.31	8.85	4.47	1.15	12	0.82
203	Maili	13.47	2.93	14.53	3.49	1.05	18	1.68
206	Nanakuli E1	6.92	2.26	7.11	2.75	0.19	35	0.36
303	Kaaawa	7.00	1.41	6.50	3.54	-0.50	1	0.33
306	Laie	6.40	4.12	9.30	4.79	2.90	9	1.98
310	Waimanalo	6.00	3.65	6.67	2.08	0.67	2	0.33
404	Wahiawa	6.27	2.69	8.45	3.36	2.18	10	1.91
502	Koloa	11.83	3.97	14.07	3.62	2.24++	28	5.16**
603	Kula	8.00	0.00	9.00	1.41	1.00	1	1.00
703	Holualoa	7.00	1.41	11.50	0.71	4.50	1	3.00
704	Honaunau	7.25	2.71	9.13	2.90	1.88	7	3.07*
705	Hookena	4.00	1.69	4.75	2.19	0.75	7	1.03
706	Kapiolani	5.25	2.55	6.79	3.17	1.54++	27	2.56*
708	Keaukaha	8.00	3.08	8.44	2.60	0.44	8	0.61
711	Laupahoehoe	8.22	3.19	11.11	4.28	2.89++	8	3.00*
713	Paauilo	6.11	3.69	11.33	3.84	5.22++	8	5.39**
714	Pahoa	9.33	7.00	11.00	5.93	1.67	5	1.69

Table 34

Analysis of Regression of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Numbers Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Regression	1	2785.793	2785.793	295.672**
Residual	228	2148.191	9.422	
Total	229	4933.984		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 35

Analyses of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Copying Subtest)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
101	Anuenue	1.60	2.99	1.70	2.26	0.10	9	0.18
103	Kaahumanu	3.30	2.79	2.55	2.24	-0.75	19	1.49
109	Kauluwela	2.57	1.81	4.43	2.37	1.86	6	4.04**
110	Lanakila	6.45	2.46	5.27	1.95	-1.18	10	3.13**
111	Likelike	4.63	3.96	6.63	3.96	2.00+	15	3.20**
115	Royal	1.92	2.14	4.00	2.35	2.08	12	3.71**
203	Maili	3.00	3.06	9.79	2.12	6.79++	18	10.08**
206	Nanakuli El	1.22	1.31	2.39	1.57	1.17	35	5.49**
303	Kaaawa	2.50	3.54	3.50	4.95	1.00	1	1.00
306	Laie	1.10	1.60	1.90	2.18	0.80	9	1.81
310	Waimanalo	5.33	4.16	4.67	1.15	-0.67	2	0.38
404	Wahiawa	0.82	0.98	2.64	1.21	1.82	10	4.54**
502	Koloa	7.14	4.03	10.14	3.94	3.00++	28	4.53**
603	Kula	10.00	0.00	9.50	0.71	-0.50	1	1.00
703	Holualoa	4.50	3.54	5.00	4.24	0.50	1	1.00
704	Honaunau	4.25	2.43	7.13	1.96	2.88++	7	3.21**
705	Hookena	10.78	2.33	11.56	2.01	0.78	8	1.36
706	Kapiolani	1.61	2.01	3.25	3.01	1.64	27	4.38**
708	Keaukaha	4.56	2.70	5.11	2.67	0.56	8	0.60
711	Laupahoehoe	5.11	4.20	7.89	3.10	2.78	8	2.12
713	Paauilo	2.67	2.00	5.89	3.02	3.22++	8	4.87**
714	Pahoa	2.17	3.25	3.00	2.10	0.83	5	1.39

Table 36

Analysis of Regression of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Copying Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio**
Regression	1	1550.766	1550.766	179.049**
Residual	228	1974.734	8.661	
Total	229	3525.500		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 37

Analyses of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Total Score)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
101	Anuenue	18.50	12.19	17.70	15.30	-0.80	9	0.32
103	Kaahumanu	35.60	12.98	46.05	10.28	10.45	19	3.91**
105	Kaiulani	11.54	3.64	26.15	15.08	14.62&	12	3.70**
109	Kauluwela	35.43	10.00	47.43	15.28	12.00++	6	2.98*
110	Lanakila	50.27	19.65	53.82	16.18	3.55	10	1.39
111	Likelike	31.81	12.22	40.88	11.77	9.06	15	3.95**
115	Royal	34.31	14.50	43.15	14.78	8.85	12	2.80*
203	Maili	57.47	9.30	73.74	7.44	16.26++	18	10.74**
206	Nanakuli El	34.61	6.46	39.19	8.99	4.58	35	3.12**
303	Kaaawa	34.00	12.73	35.50	20.51	1.50	1	0.27
306	Laie	28.60	13.43	36.90	13.25	8.30	9	2.05
310	Waimanalo	38.67	9.81	45.33	15.04	6.67	2	1.54
404	Wahiawa	29.55	9.51	39.00	10.04	9.45	10	3.86**
502	Koloa	57.86	13.15	72.00	7.60	14.14++	28	8.82**
603	Kula	40.00	5.66	53.50	4.95	13.50	1	1.80
703	Holualoa	46.50	14.85	61.50	12.02	15.00	1	7.50
704	Honaunau	35.00	13.77	53.88	11.81	18.88++	7	8.20**
705	Hookena	63.78	10.18	65.33	11.94	1.56	8	0.90
706	Kapiolani	27.61	7.53	34.61	11.59	7.00	27	5.09**
708	Keaukaha	34.22	11.61	42.67	13.74	8.44	8	3.15**
711	Laupahoehoe	37.89	13.02	51.78	14.58	13.89++	8	6.71**
713	Paauilo	27.56	10.83	49.67	10.4	22.11++	8	8.28**
714	Pahoa	35.33	9.54	41.67	16.68	6.33	5	1.62

Table 38

Analysis of Regression of Kindergarten Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (22 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Total Score)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	59140.816	59140.816	674.195**
Residual	228	20000.309	87.721	
Total	229	79141.125		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression
&Total mean gain score based on two subtests only

Table 39

Analysis of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Word Meaning Subtest)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
101	Anuenue	6.00	1.41	7.11	1.62	1.11++	8	1.70
102	Fern	5.44	2.60	7.22	1.99	1.78	8	2.40*
103	Kaahumanu	8.57	1.95	9.04	1.87	0.48	22	0.92
104	Kaewai	6.21	1.82	6.08	2.14	-0.13	37	0.34
105	Kaiulani	6.97	1.76	6.86	1.85	-0.10	28	0.21
107	Kalihi-kai	6.52	2.14	8.22	2.42	1.70++	26	2.63**
108	Kalihi-waena	6.71	2.14	6.57	1.72	-0.14	6	0.26
109	Kaluwela	7.11	1.54	8.78	2.39	1.67++	8	2.29*
111	Likelike	5.62	1.69	6.10	1.76	0.48	20	1.16
112	Linapuni	6.46	2.66	7.57	1.97	1.11	27	2.13*
115	Royal	7.00	1.83	10.50	2.65	3.50++	3	7.00**
203	Maili	6.56	2.04	9.78	2.16	3.22++	17	5.55**
206	Nanakuli El.	5.66	2.00	6.28	1.89	0.62	28	1.21
210	Makaha	5.53	2.25	6.47	2.63	0.95	18	1.34
302	Hauula	6.48	1.94	6.97	1.90	0.48	28	0.92
303	Kaaawa	7.43	1.62	7.57	2.64	0.14	6	0.13
304	Kahaluu	6.30	2.45	8.00	2.16	1.70	9	1.95
306	Laie	8.89	2.08	7.06	2.46	-1.83++	17	2.71**
309	Ben Parker	8.08	2.00	7.96	1.73	-0.13	23	0.25
310	Waimanalo	6.00	2.00	6.33	0.58	0.33	2	0.28
402	Waialua	7.60	1.96	7.30	2.31	-0.30	9	0.42
403	Aiea	6.12	1.90	12.00	2.32	5.88++	16	11.45**
404	Wahiawa	7.75	2.22	8.58	2.15	0.83	11	1.70
405	Haliewa	6.93	2.74	6.67	2.32	-0.27	14	0.40
502	Koloa	7.16	2.22	7.79	2.46	0.63	18	1.03
603	Kula	7.93	1.77	8.36	2.56	0.43	13	0.70
607	Wailuku	5.22	2.05	7.33	2.12	2.11	8	2.46*
703	Holualoa	8.06	2.21	10.38	3.03	2.31++	15	3.31**
704	Honaunau	6.00	1.58	7.11	1.36	1.11	8	1.55
705	Hookena	7.56	1.94	8.00	1.73	0.44	8	0.69
706	Kapiolani	7.65	2.06	7.50	1.70	-0.15	19	0.29
708	Keaukaha	7.60	3.58	8.40	2.41	0.80	4	0.83
711	Laupahoehoe	6.53	2.36	7.80	1.86	1.27	14	1.81
712	Naalehu	8.71	1.98	8.29	2.30	-0.43	13	0.69
713	Paauilo	7.75	3.30	7.75	1.50	0.00	3	0.00
714	Pahoa	6.80	1.10	8.80	1.79	2.00	4	1.69

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 40

Analysis of Regression of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Word Meaning Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Regression	1	200.840	200.840	37.929**
Residual	520	2753.508	5.295	
Total	521	2954.348		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 41

Analyses of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Listening Subtest)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
101	Anuenue	7.44	2.01	7.44	2.70	0.00	8	0.00
102	Fern	7.67	2.29	8.44	2.19	0.78	8	0.71
103	Kaahumanu	9.13	2.65	10.48	2.91	1.35	22	1.95
104	Kaewai	8.45	2.54	9.37	3.25	0.92	37	1.49
105	Kaiulani	9.14	2.39	8.24	2.85	-0.90	28	1.36
107	Kalihi-kai	8.78	2.36	9.59	2.26	0.81	26	1.54
108	Kalihi-waena	9.57	3.26	10.14	1.57	0.57	6	0.62
109	Kaluwela	9.78	2.77	10.22	2.64	0.44	8	0.36
111	Likelike	8.19	1.91	8.38	2.58	0.19	20	0.33
112	Linapuni	9.46	2.20	9.07	2.39	-0.39	27	0.89
115	Royal	9.50	2.65	10.75	2.75	1.25	3	1.00
203	Maili	8.83	2.41	10.61	2.33	1.78++	17	3.29**
206	Nanakuli El	8.07	1.98	8.86	2.39	0.79	28	1.77
210	Makaha	7.37	2.79	7.63	3.47	0.26	18	0.23
302	Hauula	9.03	2.28	9.83	2.69	0.79	28	1.58
303	Kaaawa	10.14	1.07	8.14	1.68	-2.00++	6	3.06*
304	Kahaluu	8.40	1.65	10.70	1.89	2.30	9	2.91*
306	Laie	10.44	1.82	9.22	2.44	-1.22	17	1.84
309	Ben Parker	8.63	2.68	10.38	2.62	1.75++	23	2.99**
310	Waimanalo	9.00	2.00	9.67	0.58	0.67	2	0.46
402	Waialua	6.50	2.64	8.60	3.27	2.10	9	2.64*
403	Aiea	8.12	2.23	9.94	2.08	1.82++	16	2.26*
404	Wahiawa	9.17	1.80	11.92	2.07	2.75++	11	3.94**
405	Haleiwa	8.87	1.55	9.20	2.21	0.33	14	0.49
502	Koloa	11.00	1.91	10.63	3.04	-0.37	18	0.71
603	Kula	9.43	1.70	10.14	1.46	0.71	13	1.16
607	Wailuku	7.33	2.06	8.33	2.18	1.00	8	8.93
703	Holualoa	10.31	2.60	11.75	2.18	1.44++	15	2.79**
704	Honaunau	9.00	2.00	7.78	2.11	-1.22	8	1.28
705	Hookena	10.56	1.94	11.44	2.24	0.89	8	1.00
706	Kapiolani	8.80	2.24	9.65	1.76	0.85	19	1.92
708	Keaukaha	12.00	1.58	11.40	2.30	-0.60	4	0.42
711	Laupahoehoe	9.73	1.71	10.13	1.64	0.40	14	0.69
712	Naalehu	11.36	1.95	11.71	1.59	0.36	13	0.70
713	Paauilo	9.75	1.26	11.75	1.71	2.00	3	1.41
714	Pahoa	7.80	0.84	10.60	2.30	2.80	4	2.42

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 42

Analysis of Regression of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Listening Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	336.835	336.835	56.207**
Residual	520	3116.227	5.993	
Total	521	3453.063		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 43

Analyses of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Matching Subtest)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
101	Anuenue	9.98	3.59	9.78	3.96	-0.11	8	0.14
102	Fern	8.00	2.65	11.44	1.51	3.44++	8	4.30**
103	Kaahumanu	10.78	2.97	11.87	2.44	1.09	22	1.80
104	Kaewai	8.63	2.73	10.08	3.03	1.45	37	2.64**
105	Kaiulani	8.00	3.56	10.17	3.87	2.17	28	4.31**
107	Kalihi-kai	9.93	2.51	12.00	1.88	2.07++	26	7.22**
108	Kalihi-waena	9.57	2.94	9.86	3.13	0.29	6	0.31
109	Kaluwela	11.78	1.48	10.89	1.90	-0.89	8	1.24
111	Likelike	8.90	2.90	10.48	1.91	1.57	20	2.69**
112	Linapuni	10.00	2.52	11.46	2.28	1.46++	27	3.93**
115	Royal	9.75	2.63	11.75	1.89	2.00	3	1.36
203	Maili	7.67	2.66	10.06	2.34	2.39	17	4.72**
206	Nanakuli El.	9.00	2.83	10.45	1.96	1.45	28	3.08**
210	Makaha	5.53	4.38	6.68	4.36	1.16	18	0.98
302	Hauula	9.48	2.82	10.45	2.61	0.97	28	1.90
303	Kaaawa	9.57	1.27	9.14	2.27	-0.43	6	0.51
304	Kahaluu	6.40	3.31	10.90	2.51	4.50++	9	3.58*
306	Laie	9.83	2.01	10.83	2.07	1.00	17	1.82
309	Ben Parker	6.54	3.72	11.25	1.94	4.71++	23	6.98**
310	Waimanalo	7.67	2.52	7.00	4.36	-0.67	2	0.23
402	Waialua	7.90	3.00	10.50	1.51	2.60+	9	3.07**
403	Aiea	10.12	2.47	12.94	1.48	2.82++	16	5.40**
404	Wahiawa	9.08	2.91	10.33	3.31	1.25	11	1.74
405	Haleiwa	7.13	3.34	9.07	4.15	1.93	14	1.71
502	Koloa	10.74	2.51	12.26	1.41	1.53++	18	3.62**
603	Kula	9.50	2.82	10.79	3.19	1.29	13	1.35
607	Wailuku	7.22	3.60	11.11	1.05	3.89++	8	2.91*
703	Holualoa	9.44	1.82	10.75	2.74	1.31	15	1.66
704	Honaunau	4.00	2.45	9.11	4.57	5.11++	8	4.60**
705	Hookena	9.67	1.80	9.89	1.45	0.22	8	0.41
706	Kapiolani	8.35	2.32	8.80	2.46	0.45	19	0.61
708	Keaukaha	9.80	2.28	9.80	4.21	0.00	4	0.00
711	Laupahoehoe	8.73	3.31	10.47	1.73	1.73	14	3.03**
712	Naalehu	11.21	1.85	9.57	2.53	-1.64++	13	3.23**
713	Paauilo	7.75	2.99	9.75	1.26	2.00	3	1.26
714	Pahoa	6.20	3.70	9.40	2.97	3.20	4	2.58

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 44

Analysis of Regression of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Matching Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	954.354	954.354	159.713**
Residual	520	3107.225	5.975	
Total	521	4061.578		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 45

Analyses of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Alphabet Subtest)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
101	Anuenue	8.44	4.50	12.78	4.68	4.33++	8	3.96**
102	Fern	13.33	2.92	15.11	1.54	1.78	8	1.92
103	Kaahumanu	13.17	2.72	15.48	0.59	2.30++	22	4.40**
104	Kaewai	10.32	4.10	12.97	4.35	2.66+	37	3.85**
105	Kaiulani	8.76	4.97	11.52	5.23	2.76	28	3.96**
107	Kalihi-kai	13.07	3.16	14.74	1.61	1.67	26	3.39**
108	Kalihi-waena	13.29	3.86	14.00	4.00	0.71	6	0.92
109	Kaluwela	13.67	2.45	14.00	3.08	0.33	8	0.41
111	Likelike	9.86	4.59	12.33	3.77	2.48	20	4.46**
112	Linapuni	12.04	3.51	13.89	2.53	1.86	27	3.90**
115	Royal	12.25	1.89	13.25	2.36	1.00	3	0.93
203	Maili	11.33	4.43	14.56	1.65	3.22++	17	3.52**
206	Nanakuli El.	11.38	3.57	13.83	2.22	2.45	28	4.19**
210	Makaha	6.16	4.43	8.21	5.47	2.05	18	1.43
302	Hauula	11.97	3.93	12.48	3.84	0.52	28	1.15
303	Kaaawa	11.57	3.55	13.71	3.90	2.14	6	2.23
304	Kahaluu	10.80	4.16	13.20	2.62	2.40	9	2.84*
306	Laie	13.22	2.76	15.00	0.91	1.78++	17	2.90**
309	Ben Parker	9.71	4.20	14.54	2.23	4.83++	23	6.82**
310	Waimanalo	13.33	2.52	14.67	1.53	1.33	2	2.00
402	Waialua	9.30	4.19	12.50	4.33	3.20	9	2.82*
403	Aiea	13.24	2.84	15.47	1.23	2.24++	16	3.82**
404	Wahiawa	11.58	4.80	14.00	3.25	2.42	11	2.15
405	Haleiwa	6.27	3.86	11.07	3.90	4.80	14	5.30**
502	Koloa	14.63	1.83	15.32	1.20	0.68	18	2.00
603	Kula	12.43	2.74	14.93	1.07	2.50++	13	3.83**
607	Wailuku	8.44	3.91	14.11	2.32	5.67++	8	5.75**
703	Holualoa	13.31	3.65	14.81	2.66	1.50	15	3.67**
704	Honaunau	11.11	4.81	15.22	1.99	4.11++	8	3.31**
705	Hookena	14.78	1.48	13.44	2.55	-1.33	8	1.89
706	Kapiolani	8.10	3.81	9.50	3.69	1.40	19	2.93**
708	Keaukaha	12.40	5.86	13.40	4.16	1.00	4	1.20
711	Laupahoehoe	11.20	4.99	15.00	1.51	3.80++	14	2.93**
712	Naalehu	13.86	1.66	14.64	2.56	0.79	13	1.56
713	Paauilo	8.25	5.50	15.00	1.15	6.75	3	2.82
714	Pahoa	8.20	5.36	14.60	2.07	6.40++	4	2.96*

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 46

Analysis of Regression of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Alphabet Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	2766.059	2766.059	436.848**
Residual	520	3292.566	6.332	
Total	521	6058.625		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 47

Analyses of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Numbers Subtest)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
101	Anuenue	8.11	2.80	11.00	4.06	2.89	8	3.09**
102	Fern	10.22	3.60	12.89	4.04	2.67++	8	2.67*
103	Kaahumanu	13.22	3.10	14.30	3.02	1.09	22	1.90
104	Kaewai	9.26	3.15	12.53	4.12	3.26++	37	4.70**
105	Kaiulani	10.48	3.97	10.52	3.56	0.03	28	0.07
107	Kalihi-kai	11.74	3.81	13.89	3.40	2.15++	26	3.39**
108	Kalihi-waena	10.71	3.64	14.43	4.86	3.71++	6	4.60**
109	Kaluwela	13.67	4.18	14.22	4.84	0.56	8	0.73*
111	Likelike	10.10	3.21	10.95	2.48	0.86	20	1.43
112	Linapuni	12.93	3.50	13.75	3.80	0.82	27	1.66
115	Royal	16.25	5.12	14.50	5.20	-1.75	3	1.22
203	Maili	10.06	3.32	14.06	2.82	4.00++	17	5.96**
206	Nanakuli El	11.62	3.50	15.41	3.02	3.79	28	5.15**
210	Makaha	8.37	3.09	8.84	4.73	0.49	18	0.42
302	Hauula	13.07	4.24	12.83	3.95	-0.24	28	0.53
303	Kaaawa	12.14	3.44	12.57	2.94	0.43	6	0.57
304	Kahaluu	10.40	2.88	11.60	3.78	1.20	9	1.13
306	Laie	16.39	2.28	14.94	3.06	-1.44	17	1.85
309	Ben Parker	8.38	2.67	14.25	3.40	5.88++	23	8.83**
310	Waimanalo	10.67	2.08	11.00	1.00	0.33	2	0.20
402	Waialua	8.30	3.27	11.20	2.25	2.90	9	3.14**
403	Aiea	11.59	2.29	14.59	3.04	3.00++	16	4.76**
404	Wahiawa	12.58	3.29	14.75	2.96	2.17++	11	3.12**
405	Haleiwa	7.93	3.26	10.87	2.67	2.93	14	3.20**
502	Koloa	13.47	4.40	15.84	3.82	2.37++	18	3.75**
603	Kula	8.93	2.59	11.64	2.56	2.71	13	3.65**
607	Wailuku	9.33	1.66	12.33	2.29	3.00++	8	4.24**
703	Holualoa	13.31	3.46	16.13	4.75	2.81++	15	3.24**
704	Honaunau	8.89	2.67	13.22	3.60	4.33++	8	2.71*
705	Hookena	10.44	3.84	11.00	5.77	0.56	8	0.51
706	Kapiolani	9.85	3.22	11.10	3.42	1.25	19	1.92
708	Keaukaha	12.60	4.04	13.60	3.05	1.00	4	0.71
711	Laupahoehoe	10.33	3.27	12.33	2.41	2.00	14	2.50*
712	Naalehu	14.29	2.73	14.71	2.33	0.43	13	0.49
713	Paauilo	11.00	5.23	13.50	1.00	2.50	3	0.86
714	Pahoa	11.60	1.34	13.00	2.00	1.40	4	0.98

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 48

Analyses of Regression of First Grade Title I 1969-70
Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the
Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Numbers Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	2701.609	2701.609	307.323**
Residual	520	4571.203	8.791	
Total	521	7272.813		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 49

Analyses of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Copying Subtest)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
101	Anuenue	5.89	3.14	5.89	3.02	0.00	8	0.00
102	Fern	6.22	2.05	7.22	1.09	1.00	8	1.66
103	Kaahumanu	7.61	2.62	7.26	3.25	-0.35	22	0.48
104	Kaewai	5.89	2.37	5.68	2.54	-0.21	37	0.45
105	Kaiulani	5.93	3.12	7.76	3.58	1.83++	28	3.43**
107	Kalihi-kai	7.44	2.12	10.63	2.32	3.19++	26	8.04**
108	Kalihi-waena	6.00	1.00	9.71	2.63	3.71++	6	4.29**
109	Kaluwela	6.33	1.94	6.56	1.42	0.22	8	0.48
111	Likelike	10.62	2.92	10.52	2.75	-0.10	20	0.20
112	Linapuni	5.71	3.10	6.64	2.60	0.93	27	2.37*
115	Royal	8.50	5.57	7.25	2.22	--1.25	3	0.66
203	Maili	2.67	1.71	6.33	2.54	3.67++	17	6.35**
206	Nanakuli El	6.83	2.87	8.45	2.56	1.62	28	4.13**
210	Makaha	5.26	4.32	5.79	3.54	0.53	18	0.75
302	Hauula	8.17	3.30	7.79	2.68	-0.38	28	0.68
303	Kaaawa	8.71	3.90	9.14	2.79	0.43	6	0.39
304	Kahaluu	6.10	3.38	6.00	4.06	-0.10	9	0.08
306	Laie	6.22	2.29	5.94	2.55	-0.28	17	0.40
309	Ben Parker	4.17	1.81	8.67	1.97	4.50++	23	11.82**
310	Waimanalo	4.67	3.06	4.67	2.08	0.00	2	0.00
402	Waialua	7.00	3.62	6.30	2.98	-0.70	9	0.77
403	Aiea	7.94	3.45	9.71	3.64	1.76++	16	3.12**
404	Wahiawa	5.92	2.43	7.33	2.53	1.42	11	3.03**
405	Haleiwa	6.07	2.96	9.47	3.34	3.40++	14	4.08**
502	Koloa	6.16	2.77	10.16	2.83	4.00++	18	5.85**
603	Kula	8.86	2.44	9.93	2.50	1.07	13	1.42
607	Wailuku	5.89	3.10	7.44	2.07	1.56	8	1.47
703	Holualoa	7.69	2.89	5.88	1.31	-1.81++	15	2.35*
704	Honaunau	4.78	3.38	9.00	2.12	4.22++	8	5.43**
705	Hookena	10.78	2.33	11.56	2.01	0.78	8	1.36
706	Kapiolani	5.60	2.84	5.90	2.53	0.30	19	0.74
708	Keaukaha	9.80	2.95	6.60	3.58	-3.20++	4	4.35**
711	Laupahoehoe	11.73	1.53	10.40	1.96	-1.33	14	2.81**
712	Naalehu	11.57	1.99	8.79	1.63	-2.79++	13	4.48**
713	Paauilo	2.75	4.27	12.75	0.96	10.00++	3	2.94**
714	Pahoa	9.20	3.27	6.00	2.45	-3.20++	4	3.30*

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 50

Analyses of Regression of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Copying Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1345.139	1345.139	185.591**
Residual	520	3768.896	7.48	
Total	521	5114.035		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 51

Analyses of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Total Score)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
101	Anuenue	45.67	12.60	54.00	17.16	8.33	8	2.46*
102	Fern	50.89	10.76	62.33	8.23	11.44++	8	4.78**
103	Kaahumanu	62.04	9.73	67.52	8.92	5.48	22	4.25**
104	Kaewai	48.76	10.40	56.45	15.23	7.68+	37	3.70**
105	Kaiulani	49.28	13.53	55.07	16.50	5.79	28	4.20**
107	Kalihi-kai	57.48	9.66	68.07	10.80	10.59++	26	7.84**
108	Kalihi-waena	55.86	12.58	65.43	12.74	9.57++	6	5.40**
109	Kaluwela	62.22	9.88	64.67	12.30	2.44	8	1.06
111	Likelike	53.29	10.71	58.76	10.26	5.48	20	4.25**
112	Linapuni	56.86	12.50	62.39	12.56	5.54	27	4.56**
115	Royal	63.25	13.72	71.25	18.48	8.00	3	1.34
203	Maili	47.11	10.29	65.50	8.90	18.39++	17	12.46**
206	Nanakuli El.	52.55	9.50	63.28	9.19	10.72	28	8.76**
210	Makaha	38.42	14.40	43.63	20.49	5.21	18	1.06
302	Hauula	57.83	14.60	60.34	12.68	2.52	28	2.01
303	Kaaawa	59.57	8.90	60.29	7.83	0.71	6	0.26
304	Kahaluu	48.40	11.08	60.40	11.74	12.00++	9	3.63**
306	Laie	65.00	6.40	63.00	7.17	-2.00	17	1.07
309	Ben Parker	45.50	10.54	67.04	8.44	21.54++	23	16.22**
310	Waimanalo	51.67	3.21	53.33	4.04	1.67	2	0.56
402	Waialua	46.60	9.28	56.40	8.76	9.80	9	4.10**
403	Aiea	57.06	10.14	74.65	6.55	17.59++	16	10.58**
404	Wahiawa	56.08	11.59	66.92	11.74	10.83++	11	4.59**
405	Hale'iwa	43.20	12.96	56.33	11.65	13.13++	14	4.73**
502	Koloa	62.42	12.67	71.11	11.08	8.68++	18	4.39**
603	Kula	57.07	8.89	65.79	9.61	8.71++	13	4.81**
607	Wailuku	43.44	7.11	60.67	5.17	17.22++	8	12.03**
703	Holualoa	62.13	12.34	69.69	12.44	7.56+	15	3.92**
704	Honaunau	43.78	11.13	61.56	11.52	17.78++	8	6.20**
705	Hookena	63.78	10.18	65.33	11.94	1.56	8	0.90
706	Kapiolani	45.35	9.00	52.45	11.17	4.10	19	4.50**
708	Keaukaha	64.20	16.45	63.20	16.96	-1.00	4	0.29
711	Laupahoehoe	58.93	8.49	66.13	7.32	7.20	14	4.31**
712	Naalehu	71.00	7.41	67.71	7.44	-3.29+	13	2.33*
713	Paauilo	47.25	18.66	70.50	0.58	23.25	3	2.46
714	Pahoa	49.80	7.12	62.40	8.14	12.60++	4	5.60**

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 52

Analysis of Regression of First Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (36 Schools) on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests (Total Score)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	42457.746	42457.746	587.193**
Residual	520	37599.254	72.306	
Total	521	80057.000		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 53

Analyses of Second Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (19 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary B)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
203	Maili	9.58	1.83	14.50	6.32	4.92	11	2.41*
210	Makaha	15.00	11.30	16.17	12.20	1.17	17	0.61
402	Waialua	7.80	4.55	9.60	4.22	1.80	4	1.77
403	Aiea	9.18	2.60	16.12	4.03	6.94++	16	5.96**
404	Wahiawa	11.00	1.58	17.00	4.30	6.00	4	3.00*
501	Waimea	11.50	3.87	11.83	5.54	0.33	11	0.16
506	Kalaheo	11.50	8.54	18.75	11.50	7.25	3	3.75*
602	Waihee	8.86	7.36	15.71	2.56	6.86+	6	3.09*
603	Kula	18.09	9.59	23.91	9.30	5.82++	10	3.36**
604	Kihei	16.00	2.73	25.00	5.66	9.00++	7	3.41**
607	Wailuku	15.33	4.10	18.50	5.90	3.17	11	2.54
703	Holualoa	21.80	8.80	27.00	10.28	5.20++	9	2.42*
704	Honaunau	12.67	6.43	16.67	6.35	4.00	2	0.66
705	Hookena	8.38	4.87	11.13	6.03	2.75	7	1.00
708	Keaukaha	14.10	8.35	16.80	8.20	2.70	9	1.84
711	Laupahoehoe	11.75	5.42	18.63	5.24	6.88++	7	5.40**
712	Naalehu	19.75	3.06	23.63	7.56	3.88	7	1.40
713	Paauilo	13.25	1.67	21.00	7.48	7.75++	7	2.88*
714	Pahoa	19.00	5.66	17.50	4.95	-1.50	1	3.00

Table 54

Analysis of Regression of Second Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (19 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary B)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	4726.629	4726.629	127.057**
Residual	161	5989.336		
Total	162	10715.965		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 55

Analyses of Second Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (19 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Primary B)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
203	Maili	7.00	3.49	10.42	3.75	3.42+	11	5.86**
210	Makaha	11.06	5.99	9.22	7.73	-1.83	17	1.71
402	Waialua	8.60	1.34	6.40	1.82	-2.20	4	1.58
403	Aiea	7.24	2.02	7.06	3.72	-0.18	16	0.22
404	Wahiawa	5.00	1.87	9.40	4.28	4.40	4	2.44
501	Waimea	8.42	3.92	8.42	2.54	0.00	11	0.00
506	Kalaheo	6.00	12.00	8.50	8.58	2.50	3	1.19
602	Waihee	3.29	3.15	10.43	4.31	7.14++	6	5.35**
603	Kula	12.27	6.23	13.27	6.05	1.00	10	1.25
604	Kihei	8.75	3.41	12.25	5.92	3.50	7	1.35
607	Wailuku	9.50	2.28	13.75	6.05	4.25++	11	2.39*
703	Holualoa	13.40	7.14	15.90	5.00	2.50	9	1.27
704	Honaunau	13.33	7.02	16.67	5.86	3.33	2	0.57
705	Hookena	3.25	3.45	6.63	3.50	3.38	7	2.45*
708	Keaukaha	11.70	5.93	9.90	7.17	-1.80	9	0.90
711	Laupahoehoe	6.75	4.43	11.13	4.16	4.38++	7	2.30*
712	Naalehu	10.88	4.61	15.50	6.57	4.63	7	1.32
713	Paauilo	8.63	4.10	9.00	5.13	0.38	7	0.19
714	Pahoa	11.50	4.95	10.50	2.12	-1.00	1	0.50

Table 56

Analysis of Regression of Second Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (19 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1266.792	1266.792	51.583**
Residual	161	3953.896	24.558	
Total	162	5220.688		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 57

Analyses of Third Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (17 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary B)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
203	Maili	12.11	2.15	15.67	6.08	3.56	8	1.37
210	Makaha	19.00	10.09	23.00	10.97	4.00	17	3.96**
402	Waialua	12.25	4.92	14.25	4.35	2.00	3	2.83
403	Aiea	13.45	4.68	20.55	6.83	7.09++	10	4.02**
404	Wahiawa	18.38	9.83	21.88	13.51	3.50	7	1.22
501	Waimea	22.83	8.54	27.17	9.28	4.33+	5	3.25*
603	Kula	26.89	5.80	28.78	7.45	1.89	8	2.16
605	Paia	36.25	8.23	35.25	8.18	-1.00	11	0.73
607	Wailuku	22.00	6.54	27.22	7.53	5.22++	8	3.86**
609	Kilohana	16.60	3.91	21.20	8.90	4.60	4	1.49
703	Holualoa	24.29	9.27	30.00	8.96	5.71++	6	5.38**
704	Honaunau	19.33	8.33	34.00	7.00	14.67++	2	16.63**
705	Hookena	18.14	4.56	18.00	8.12	-0.14	6	0.07
708	Keaukaha	25.25	12.23	26.00	12.68	0.75	3	0.88
711	Laupahoehoe	19.33	11.85	20.33	13.65	1.00	2	0.87
712	Naalehu	22.75	5.85	25.38	7.50	2.63	7	1.70
714	Pahoa	19.60	8.56	24.00	7.84	4.40	4	2.21

Table 58

Analysis of Regression of Third Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (17 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary B)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	9323.305	9323.305	324.450**
Residual	126	3620.695	28.736	
Total	127	12944.000		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 59

Analyses of Third Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (17 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Primary B)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
203 Maili	8.33	2.06	11.33	2.24	3.00	8	2.71*
210 Makaha	12.22	6.94	14.94	8.54	2.72	17	2.01
402 Waialua	7.75	2.22	6.00	3.83	-1.75	3	0.63
403 Aiea	10.18	2.75	10.91	7.13	0.73	10	0.49
404 Wahiawa	12.88	9.13	14.75	8.55	1.88	7	1.44
501 Waimea	13.83	5.56	14.17	5.95	0.33	5	0.33
603 Kula	16.44	5.34	16.78	7.36	0.33	8	0.17
605 Paia	25.25	4.03	25.17	4.82	-0.08	11	0.05
607 Wailuku	10.33	2.92	18.44	4.19	8.11++	8	4.96**
609 Kilohana	10.00	3.00	12.00	7.14	2.00	4	0.94
703 Holualoa	15.14	4.74	20.43	5.22	5.29++	6	7.77**
704 Honaunau	13.00	6.24	22.33	4.93	9.33++	2	7.00*
705 Hookena	9.29	3.86	10.43	3.82	1.14	6	0.88
708 Keaukaha	16.00	8.60	18.25	10.21	2.25	3	1.17
711 Laupahoehoe	13.00	4.58	8.33	4.51	-4.67++	2	14.00**
712 Naalehu	11.13	5.82	12.88	5.36	1.75	7	1.37
714 Pahoa	11.40	3.29	11.60	6.04	0.20	4	0.14

Table 60

Analysis of Regression of Third Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (17 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Primary B)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	4234.691	4234.691	173.604**
Residual	126	3073.488	24.393	
Total	127	7308.180		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 61

Analyses of Fourth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (13 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary C)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
401	Halawa	23.54	7.26	24.85	7.03	1.31	12	0.78
402	Waialua	15.13	4.85	16.88	5.41	1.75	7	0.93
403	Aiea	22.17	5.85	23.83	7.86	1.67	5	0.79
501	Waimea	22.89	6.05	24.00	5.36	1.11	8	1.00
503	Kapaa	30.69	4.91	33.23	5.05	2.54++	12	2.95**
506	Kalaheo	29.00	7.62	31.75	4.79	2.75	3	1.13
603	Kula	33.25	2.06	33.75	6.18	0.50	3	0.23
605	Paia	36.00	7.35	35.50	5.57	-0.50	3	0.18
609	Kilohana	22.40	2.61	26.00	7.52	3.60	4	1.54
703	Holualoa	26.75	7.65	28.63	10.17	1.88	7	1.34
704	Honaunau	21.40	8.11	24.60	9.86	3.20	4	1.37
705	Hookena	22.67	6.12	22.33	7.37	-0.33	5	0.29
708	Keaukaha	27.36	7.34	29.82	6.37	2.45+	10	2.19*

Table 62

Analysis of Regression of Fourth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (13 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary C)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	4556.266	4556.266	246.075**
Residual	94	1740.484	18.516	
Total	95	6296.750		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 63

Analyses of Fourth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (13 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Primary C)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
401	Halawa	17.85	6.39	20.31	9.74	2.46	12	1.58
402	Waialua	11.13	1.46	12.88	2.36	1.75	7	1.76
403	Aiea	18.17	6.68	18.33	6.95	0.17	5	0.05
501	Waimea	14.33	4.74	20.44	4.30	6.11++	8	3.59*
503	Kapaa	23.85	6.26	28.85	8.02	5.00++	12	4.14**
506	Kalaheo	22.25	7.93	29.75	9.91	7.50	3	1.79
603	Kula	21.50	4.51	21.75	6.99	0.25	3	0.13
605	Paia	33.50	5.32	27.00	7.79	-0.65	3	2.10
609	Kilohana	19.20	6.38	17.40	4.34	-1.80	4	0.88
703	Holualoa	18.38	6.65	23.38	8.18	5.00	7	4.08**
704	Honaunau	18.60	7.67	20.20	6.57	1.60	4	0.67
705	Hookena	15.50	5.79	16.33	5.85	0.83	5	0.39
708	Keaukaha	21.09	5.26	21.36	8.56	0.27	10	0.11

Table 64

Analysis of Regression of Fourth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (13 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Primary C)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	3188.265	3188.265	86.784**
Residual	94	3453.360	36.738	
Total	95	6641.625		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 65

Analyses of Fifth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (12 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabular, Subtest, Primary C)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
401	Halawa	27.46	7.47	31.54	9.65	4.08++	12	3.03**
402	Waialua	20.13	6.15	20.50	6.85	0.38	7	0.14
403	Aiea	30.00	7.18	31.40	6.50	1.40	4	0.89
501	Waimea	32.83	6.59	35.83	7.76	3.00	5	1.84
506	Kalaheo	24.43	8.26	23.71	8.67	-0.71	6	1.18
603	Kula	33.40	6.35	37.10	7.65	3.70++	9	3.18**
604	Kihei	29.50	7.78	35.50	0.71	6.00	1	1.00
609	Kilohana	32.33	3.91	35.11	6.97	2.78	8	2.07
703	Holualoa	28.22	5.04	27.22	5.78	-1.00	8	0.51
704	Honaunau	33.67	9.71	35.17	9.04	1.50	5	0.66
705	Hookena	29.14	10.24	29.43	9.88	0.29	6	0.12
708	Keaukaha	34.78	7.90	34.89	8.21	0.11	8	0.07

Table 66

Analysis of Regression of Fifth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (12 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary C)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	5118.738	5118.738	197.433**
Residual	89	2307.449	25.926	
Total	90	7426.188		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 67

Analyses of Fifth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (12 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Primary C)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
401 Halawa	22.46	9.07	22.77	7.40	0.31	12	0.21
402 Waialua	12.63	5.97	13.63	1.51	1.00	7	0.42
403 Aiea	24.00	5.61	27.20	8.17	3.20	4	2.43
501 Waimea	24.83	8.18	27.00	7.51	2.17	5	1.47
506 Kalaheo	16.57	4.35	13.86	4.88	-2.71	6	1.82
603 Kula	25.90	8.96	27.70	8.04	1.80	9	1.08
604 Kihei	17.50	7.78	25.50	9.19	8.00	1	8.00
609 Kilohana	27.67	5.94	27.89	7.15	0.22	8	0.10
703 Holualoa	20.00	5.05	21.56	6.69	1.56	8	0.73
704 Honaunau	28.33	5.13	27.83	11.16	-0.50	5	0.14
705 Hookena	22.00	9.95	21.43	10.26	-0.57	6	0.76
708 Keaukaha	26.22	9.72	30.89	7.80	4.67++	8	3.68**

Table 68

Analysis of Regression of Fifth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (12 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Primary C)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	4577.813	4577.813	159.314**
Residual	89	2557.375	28.735	
Total	90	7135.188		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 69

Analyses of Sixth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (11 Schools) on the Gates-MacGintie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary C)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
401	Halawa	38.25	7.71	41.08	6.10	2.83++	11	2.32*
403	Aiea	30.29	5.47	31.29	7.43	1.00	6	0.54
503	Kapaa	33.08	6.99	37.46	5.25	4.38++	12	4.64**
506	Kalaheo	29.13	10.86	30.75	10.11	1.63	7	0.87
603	Kula	37.88	4.26	39.50	5.50	1.63	7	1.72
605	Paia	42.20	9.34	38.80	8.67	-3.40++	4	2.72*
609	Kilohana	38.33	3.72	45.33	1.63	7.00++	5	3.42*
703	Holualoa	32.00	10.15	33.73	11.38	1.73	10	1.61
704	Honaunau	38.40	12.40	37.60	11.80	-0.80	4	0.64
705	Hookena	36.83	3.97	36.33	6.15	-0.50	5	0.33
708	Keaukaha	36.33	4.89	37.17	6.66	0.83	11	0.82

Table 70

Analysis of Regression of Sixth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (11 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Primary C)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	4697.746	4697.746	255.886**
Residual	92	1689.004	18.359	
Total	93	6386.750		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 71

Analyses of Sixth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (11 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehensive Subtest)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
401	Halawa	30.67	9.40	36.17	8.76	5.50++	11	3.49**
403	Aiea	19.29	5.53	26.14	7.24	6.86++	6	2.77*
503	Kapaa	26.69	8.47	31.77	8.14	5.08++	12	3.97**
506	Kalaheo	20.75	10.02	16.13	8.71	-4.63	7	1.99
603	Kula	28.50	6.93	29.00	10.72	0.50	7	0.19
605	Paia	36.60	8.26	34.20	11.56	-2.40	4	1.22
609	Kilohana	36.50	3.83	39.00	4.05	2.50	5	1.54
703	Holualoa	26.73	12.69	28.73	11.90	2.00	10	1.04
704	Honaunau	34.20	10.13	36.60	12.22	2.40	4	1.86
705	Hookena	29.67	6.19	30.83	9.15	1.17	5	0.45
708	Keaukaha	28.58	10.71	33.83	8.03	5.25++	11	3.14**

Table 72

Analysis of Regression of Sixth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (11 Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehensive Subtest, Primary C)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	6827.156	6827.156	178.737**
Residual	92	3514.094	38.197	
Total	93	10341.250		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 73

Analyses of Seventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Ten Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
207	Waianae	14.66	7.18	15.66	8.30	1.00	28	0.65
306	Laie	20.33	8.50	10.33	5.05	-10.00	5	2.88*
310	Waimanalo	19.40	9.45	17.80	9.20	-1.60	4	0.28
406	Aiea	12.88	4.40	14.72	4.76	1.84	24	1.94
506	Kalaheo	16.50	4.36	33.00	6.00	16.50++	3	5.03**
702	Hilo Int	17.86	6.78	20.63	7.11	2.77	56	2.62**
703	Holualoa	16.11	5.64	20.78	7.00	4.67++	8	3.06*
704	Honaunau	17.86	5.15	19.57	3.41	1.71	6	0.75
705	Hookena	18.17	9.70	24.17	13.33	6.00	5	1.61
710	Konawaena	18.29	8.06	20.00	5.97	1.71	6	0.46

Table 74

Analysis of Regression of Seventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Ten Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1687.170	1687.170	31.868**
Residual	148	7835.523	52.943	
Total	149	9522.695		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 75

Analyses of Seventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Ten Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Primary D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
207	Waianae	10.00	2.80	11.59	4.62	1.59	28	1.92
306	Laie	20.83	8.38	7.00	4.65	-13.83	5	6.05**
310	Waimanalo	12.20	4.87	12.80	3.70	0.60	4	0.29
406	Aiea	11.44	3.55	12.56	4.66	1.12	24	1.08
506	Kalaheo	13.75	4.92	18.25	7.85	4.50	3	2.03
702	Hilo Inter.	14.30	3.85	16.84	4.86	2.54	56	4.45**
703	Holualoa	13.22	6.04	18.22	8.71	5.00++	8	3.69**
704	Honaunau	12.43	5.53	15.71	3.35	3.29+	6	2.45*
705	Hookena	13.50	8.22	16.00	9.01	2.50	5	1.35
710	Konawaena	13.43	5.13	16.43	6.43	3.00+	6	3.55**

Table 76

Analysis of Regression of Seventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Ten Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Primary D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	2115.416	2115.416	107.995**
Residual	148	2899.045	19.588	
Total	149	5014.461		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 77

Analyses of Seventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Nine Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survery D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
207	Waianae	19.24	7.14	19.31	6.72	0.07	28	0.06
310	Waimanalo	21.00	6.63	16.80	4.71	-4.20	4	1.89
406	Aiea	23.44	7.17	23.04	7.27	-0.40	24	0.22
506	Kalaheo	24.25	9.36	17.25	9.98	-7.00++	3	3.43*
702	Hilo Int.	25.40	5.92	24.21	7.59	-1.19	56	1.87
703	Holualoa	28.44	10.13	28.22	10.97	-0.22	8	0.30
704	Honaunau	25.57	6.75	26.00	7.72	0.43	6	0.27
705	Hookena	19.50	4.59	19.67	4.63	0.17	5	0.08
710	Konawaena	21.71	7.97	22.14	4.10	0.43	6	0.20

Table 78

Analysis of Regression of Seventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Nine Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survery D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	4260.043	4260.043	135.654**
Residual	148	4647.770	31.404	
Total	149	8907.813		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 79

Analyses of Seventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Nine Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
207	Waianae	16.86	4.03	23.52	7.55	6.66	28	4.74**
310	Waimanalo	18.40	9.04	17.80	6.60	-0.60	4	0.15
406	Aiea	25.76	8.87	30.20	8.64	4.44	24	2.25*
506	Kalaheo	24.75	9.03	16.00	12.33	-8.75	3	1.57
702	Hilo Int.	27.42	7.21	30.72	9.01	3.30	56	4.61**
703	Holualoa	31.56	11.93	35.00	11.74	3.44+	8	2.32*
704	Honaunau	23.57	9.29	32.00	8.12	8.43++	6	4.72**
705	Hookena	22.00	6.07	24.17	7.68	2.17	5	1.63
710	Konawaena	26.00	7.37	26.14	6.52	0.14	6	0.10

Table 80

Analysis of Regression of Seventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Nine Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survery D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	6172.043	6172.043	125.331**
Residual	148	7288.395	49.246	
Total	149	13460.438		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
+Significant at the .05 level after correction for statistical regression
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 81

Analyses of Eighth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Seven Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (Speed Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
207	Waianae	14.39	9.20	20.39	11.10	6.00	22	2.99*
208	Nanakuli[1]	5.00	3.58	15.27	9.07	10.27	10	3.73*
310	Waimanalo	17.50	13.48	13.00	2.16	-4.50	3	0.63
407	Waialua	16.33	1.53	25.00	10.15	8.67	2	1.37
703	Holualoa	15.50	6.76	22.00	10.20	6.50	3	3.52*
704	Honaunau	22.88	5.79	26.00	7.37	3.13	7	1.63
710	Konawaena	14.25	2.63	21.00	2.58	6.75	3	14.10*

[1]Administered form E instead of D

Table 82

Analysis of Regression of Eighth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Seven Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	901.335	901.335	11.580**
Residual	51	3969.458	77.833	
Total	52	4870.793		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 83

Analyses of Eighth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Seven Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (Accuracy Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
207 Waianae	8.70	3.73	11.35	5.36	2.65	22	2.33
208 Nanakuli[1]	11.73	7.72	5.82	3.74	-5.91	10	2.50*
310 Waimanalo	11.75	6.75	9.25	3.59	-2.50	3	1.35
407 Waialua	15.00	2.65	19.00	2.65	4.00	2	1.73
703 Holualoa	15.50	6.76	21.00	9.76	5.50++	3	3.54*
704 Honaunau	18.13	6.38	22.75	7.05	4.63++	7	3.11*
710 Konawaena	10.00	3.56	13.75	3.50	3.75	3	5.96**

[1]Administered Form E instead of D

Table 84

Analysis of Regression of Eighth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Seven Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1454.180	1454.180	63.336**
Residual	51	1170.952	22.960	
Total	52	2625.133		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 85

Analyses of Eighth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Eight Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
207	Waianae	15.00	7.03	14.43	8.02	-0.57	22	0.37
208	Nanakuli[1]	11.82	3.43	11.91	4.83	0.09	10	0.06
310	Waimanalo	15.75	3.30	17.00	4.55	1.25	3	0.44
407	Waialua	26.00	5.57	25.33	4.62	-0.67	2	0.55
703	Holualoa	29.75	9.98	30.25	9.71	0.50	3	0.42
704	Honaunau	30.25	7.70	32.75	8.33	2.50	7	1.42
705	Hookena	14.67	2.69	23.78	12.14	9.11	8	2.16
710	Konawaena	21.00	5.89	16.50	2.65	-4.50	3	2.56

[1]Administered Form E instead of D

Table 86

Analysis of Regression of Eighth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Eight Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	3286.369	3286.369	107.597**
Residual	51	1557.709	30.543	
Total	52	4844.078		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 87

Analyses of Eighth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Eight Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehensive Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-10-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
207	Waianae	12.26	7.41	16.00	9.77	3.74	22	2.02*
208	Nanakuli[1]	12.73	4.71	12.36	3.38	-0.36	10	0.30
310	Waimanalo	17.50	5.45	15.00	3.92	-2.50	3	0.73
407	Waialua	32.33	6.66	28.00	3.46	-4.33	2	1.59
703	Holualoa	34.75	7.37	39.00	7.02	4.25++	3	17.00**
704	Honaunau	35.25	9.16	37.50	10.01	2.25	7	1.54
705	Hookena	10.78	3.27	11.78	6.12	1.00	8	0.50
710	Konawaena	24.75	1.89	21.25	7.23	-3.50	3	1.29

[1]Administered form E instead of D

Table 88

Analysis of Regression of Eighth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Eight Schools) on the Gates-MacGinite Reading Tests (Comprehensive Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	5073.910	5073.910	107.959**
Residual	51	2396.922	46.998	
Total	52	7470.832		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 89

Analyses of Ninth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Five Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
208	Nanakuli[1]	8.80	5.03	13.00	9.30	4.21	9	1.39
209	Waianae	19.92	8.17	20.71	7.33	0.79	23	0.63
310	Waimanalo	18.62	0.58	13.33	6.43	-5.33	2	1.36
407	Waialua	18.80	6.87	17.20	4.09	-1.60	4	0.57
710	Konawaena	20.22	5.59	27.01	7.71	6.80++	73	7.75**

[1]Administered form E instead of D

Table 90

Analysis of Regression of Ninth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Five Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1379.726	1379.726	24.762**
Residual	104	5794.879	55.720	
Total	105	7174.605		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 91

Analyses of Ninth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Five Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
208	Nanakuli[1]	13.80	4.13	8.50	6.52	-5.30	9	4.16*
209	Waianae	16.04	6.62	17.54	8.22	1.50	23	1.64
310	Waimanalo	11.00	6.56	10.00	3.61	-1.00	2	0.50
407	Waialua Hi	16.60	6.19	15.00	6.40	-1.60	4	0.59
710	Konawaena	17.82	6.12	23.30	7.48	5.47++	73	9.86**

[1]Administered form E instead of D

Table 92

Analysis of Regression of Ninth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Five Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	4205.043	4205.043	154.231**
Residual	104	2835.523	27.265	
Total	105	7040.566		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level
++Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 93

Analyses of Ninth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Six Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
208	Nanakuli[1]	17.50	7.38	16.50	9.05	-1.00	9	0.37
209	Waianae	25.54	7.97	24.71	8.30	-0.83	23	0.96
310	Waimanalo	24.00	2.65	24.33	2.52	0.33	2	0.19
407	Waialua Hi	26.40	9.61	27.80	6.50	1.40	4	0.72
504	Kapaa	18.33	6.66	13.67	5.51	-4.67	2	2.00
710	Konawaena	29.32	8.08	29.66	8.83	0.34	73	0.67

[1] Administered form E instead of D

Table 94

Analysis of Regression of Ninth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Six Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	6053.078	6053.078	332.149**
Residual	104	1895.297	18.224	
Total	105	7948.375		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 95

Analyses of Ninth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Six Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survey D)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
208	Nanakuli[1]	21.90	5.99	20.10	9.87	-1.80	9	0.52
209	Waianae	31.38	9.78	31.04	10.35	-0.33	23	0.31
310	Waimanalo	20.00	12.00	16.67	1.15	-3.33	2	0.44
407	Waialua	33.20	9.78	32.60	14.45	-0.60	4	0.14
504	Kapaa	25.00	10.15	21.67	6.66	-3.33	2	1.17
710	Konawaena	34.81	9.96	35.32	11.45	0.51	73	0.70

[1]Administered form E instead of D

Table 96

Analysis of Regression of Ninth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Six Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survey D)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	9810.844	9810.844	237.091**
Residual	104	4303.531	41.380	
Total	105	14114.375		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level after correction for statistical regression

Table 97

Analyses of Tenth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-17-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
407	Waialua	15.20	4.44	14.80	6.34	-0.40	4	0.27
701	Hilo	14.89	10.18	19.44	8.32	4.56	8	0.83
710	Konawaena	20.73	9.28	25.86	6.28	5.14	43	3.66**

Table 98

Analysis of Regression of Tenth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	207.464	207.464	3.91
Residual	56	2963.106	52.913	
Total	57	3170.570		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 99

Analyses of Tenth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
407	Waialua	11.20	6.30	12.00	6.67	0.80	4	0.87
701	Hilo	8.44	5.66	14.78	5.02	6.33	8	3.86**
710	Konawaena	14.82	7.47	18.30	6.82	3.48	43	3.84**

Table 100

Analysis of Regression of Tenth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1205.287	1205.287	47.794**
Residual	56	1412.233	25.218	
Total	57	2617.520		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 101

Analyses of Tenth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Four Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
305 Kahuku	10.70	3.16	14.50	3.24	3.80	9	2.51*
407 Waialua	15.60	4.28	16.60	8.44	1.00	4	0.27
701 Hilo	14.89	7.46	15.33	6.24	0.44	8	0.24
710 Konawaena	16.66	5.57	17.66	5.34	1.00	43	1.95*

Table 102

Analysis of Regression of Tenth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Four Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	989.521	989.521	63.113**
Residual	56	877.998	15.679	
Total	57	1867.520		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 103

Analyses of Tenth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Four Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
305	Kahuku	17.10	2.51	17.80	2.82	0.70	9	1.02
407	Waialua	25.60	9.15	18.20	7.92	-7.40	4	2.22
701	Hilo	22.56	9.98	18.22	5.74	-4.33	8	1.34
710	Konawaena	22.61	9.90	24.14	9.13	1.52	43	2.05*

Table 104

Analysis of Regression of Tenth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Four Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	2474.018	2474.018	69.411**
Residual	56	1996.001	35.643	
Total	57	4470.020		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 105

Analyses of Eleventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
209	Waianae	18.92	8.81	15.92	6.65	-3.00	12	1.61
701	Hilo	18.77	10.01	18.38	9.74	-0.38	12	0.17
710	Konawaena	20.75	10.19	25.50	8.38	4.75	7	1.67

Table 106

Analysis of Regression of Eleventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	999.842	999.842	19.657**
Residual	32	1627.689	50.865	
Total	33	2627.531		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 107

Analyses of Eleventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
209	Waianae	12.54	7.17	11.23	7.00	-1.31	12	1.58
701	Hilo	16.54	7.76	15.77	8.97	-0.77	12	0.41
710	Konawaena	15.25	7.55	20.00	8.32	4.75++	7	2.32*

Table 108

Analysis of Regression of Eleventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Three Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1358.910	1358.910	40.562
Residual	32	1072.062	33.502**	
Total	33	2430.973		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 109

Analyses of Eleventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Four Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
209 Waianae	17.08	4.09	16.54	4.96	-0.54	12	0.62
504 Kapaa	24.33	10.63	19.67	5.28	-4.67	5	0.99
701 Hilo	21.62	7.12	20.08	4.70	-1.54	12	1.05
710 Konawaena	19.88	5.57	21.00	5.76	1.13	7	1.39

Table 110

Analysis of Regression of Eleventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Four Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	521.948	521.948	42.185**
Residual	32	395.935	12.373	
Total	33	917.883		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 111

Analyses of Eleventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Four Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
209	Waianae	25.69	9.24	24.92	6.46	-0.77	12	0.36
504	Kapaa	34.83	14.82	22.50	16.51	-12.33	5	2.34
701	Hilo	32.92	10.80	29.85	12.31	-3.08	12	1.31
710	Konawaena	28.00	10.25	29.25	9.68	1.25	7	0.89

Table 112

Analysis of Regression of Eleventh Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Four Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehsion Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1711.931	1711.931	37.964**
Residual	32	1443.010	45.094	
Total	33	3154.941		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 113

Analyses of Twelth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (One Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
701 Hilo	16.00	7.24	20.80	8.34	4.80	9	2.38*

Table 114

Analysis of Regression of Twelfth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (One School) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Speed Subset, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	282.256	282.256	6.577*
Residual	8	343.345	42.918	
Total	9	625.602		

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 115

Analyses of Twelfth Grade Title 1 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (One School) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
701 Hilo	13.80	6.30	16.40	6.17	2.60	9	1.63

Table 116

Analysis of Regression of Twelfth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (One School) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Accuracy Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	154.170	154.170	6.552*
Residual	8	188.231	23.529	
Total	9	342.400		

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 117

Analyses of Twelfth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Two Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
504 Kapaa	16.50	6.09	18.33	7.76	1.83	5	1.13
701 Hilo	22.00	9.88	21.70	10.34	-0.30	9	0.18

Table 118

Analysis of Regression of Twelfth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Two Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Vocabulary Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	718.036	718.036	23.536**
Residual	8	244.065	30.508	
Total	9	962.102		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 119

Analyses of Twelfth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Two Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survey E)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
504 Kapaa	33.33	11.93	29.67	14.95	-3.67	5	0.76
701 Hilo	31.00	13.14	30.80	12.16	-0.20	9	0.10

Table 120

Analysis of Regression of Twelfth Grade Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (Two Schools) on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests (Comprehension Subtest, Survey E)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio
Regression	1	1003.861	1003.861	24.504**
Residual	8	327.740	40.968	
Total	9	1331.602		

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 121

Analyses of Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (by School within Grade) on the Stanford Achievement Test (Arithmetic Computation Subtest)

Grade	SCHOOL		PRE-TEST (01-19-70)		POST-TEST (05-11-70)		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
2	708	Keaukaha	29.80	14.20	32.70	13.70	2.90	9	2.64*
2	302	Hauula	31.41	7.75	31.18	7.56	-0.24	16	0.22
3	708	Keaukaha	38.25	4.79	38.00	9.93	-0.25	3	0.08
4	302	Hauula	20.36	9.15	24.00	10.29	3.64	10	2.44*
4	708	Keaukaha	33.73	11.80	42.45	10.16	8.73	10	2.14
5	302	Hauula	24.83	7.48	23.92	11.63	-0.92	11	0.46
5	708	Keaukaha	38.56	12.46	45.33	11.24	6.78	8	2.43*
6	708	Keaukaha	18.00	6.65	20.11	8.70	2.11	8	1.22
8	710	Konawaena	13.80	2.77	15.20	4.44	1.40	4	0.61
9	710	Konawaena	17.82	6.79	18.76	6.94	0.94	71	2.01*
10	710	Konawaena	12.00	5.53	13.48	5.96	1.48	43	2.95*
11	710	Konawaena	10.63	4.00	12.13	4.42	1.50	7	2.29*

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 122

Analyses of Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (12 Schools) on the School Attitude Inventory (4-month interval)

SCHOOL	PRE-TEST Mid-Nov. 1969		POST-TEST Mid-March 1970		Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
123 McKinley Hi	109.66	23.16	116.28	22.79	6.63	31	2.19*
704 Honaunau School	124.91	15.51	128.53	17.78	3.62	33	1.36
701 Hilo Hi	118.03	22.22	119.22	24.23	1.19	36	0.4
207 Waianae Inter.	120.66	27.99	120.64	28.33	-0.02	49	0.01
117 Dole Inter.	133.02	25.20	131.65	24.10	-1.37	85	0.71
122 Kaimuki Hi	115.06	21.57	113.09	24.19	-1.97	108	1.0
121 Farrington Hi	122.93	21.87	120.82	22.51	2.11	97	1.20
118 Jarrett Inter.	126.53	17.95	123.75	20.44	-2.78	72	1.56
706 Kapiolani Elem.	134.91	22.80	131.95	22.29	-2.97	57	1.35
120 Washington Inter.	116.74	23.00	110.61	32.73	-6.13	22	1.46
119 Kalakaua Inter.	120.31	18.87	111.00	17.94	-9.31	41	2.99**
406 Aiea Inter.	143.71	17.77	130.00	26.93	-13.71	6	1.50

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table 123

Analyses of Title I 1969-70 Pre-test and Post-test Data (14 Schools) on the School Attitude Inventory (5-month interval)

	SCHOOL	PRE-TEST Mid-Nov. 1969		POST-TEST Mid-April 1970				
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	df (N-1)	t
506	Kalaheo School	100.14	26.80	136.24	24.32	36.10	20	7.23
116	Central Inter.	120.66	25.56	123.20	26.92	2.54	34	0.73
304	Kahaluu School	125.30	17.38	127.74	16.03	2.43	22	0.85
703	Holualoa Elem.	128.08	24.54	129.82	23.37	1.74	38	0.75
120	Washington Inter.	119.78	21.05	121.09	23.70	1.30	22	0.36
404	Wahiawa School	114.00	39.00	113.50	33.83	-0.50	3	0.04
303	Kaaawa Elem.	130.48	20.23	128.96	19.13	-1.52	22	0.40
308	Waiahole Elem. & Inter.	131.74	21.94	128.79	26.67	-2.95	18	0.50
710	Konawaena Hi & Inter.	120.30	24.58	113.45	27.70	-6.86	138	3.74**
406	Aiea Inter.	114.38	23.07	107.38	27.14	-7.00	12	0.90
209	Waianae Hi	117.45	24.15	110.03	24.53	-7.42	32	1.82
306	Laie School	147.05	13.58	138.05	16.55	-9.00	20	2.78**
407	Waialua Hi	111.80	25.91	101.07	13.88	-10.73	14	1.80
302	Hauula School	145.20	21.38	124.25	24.79	-20.95	19	2.66**

*Significant the the .05 level
**Significant at or beyond the .01 level